

Cornelius P. Shea to be postmaster at St. Nazianz, Wis., in place of Louis Baumgartner, resigned.

Charles L. Wolf to be postmaster at Sharon, Wis., in place of C. L. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1931.

Susan D. Olson to be postmaster at Siren, Wis., in place of S. D. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires February 24, 1931.

John M. Albers to be postmaster at Thiensville, Wis., in place of J. M. Albers. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1931.

Alphonse R. Eichman to be postmaster at Trempealeau, Wis., in place of A. R. Eichman. Incumbent's commission expires February 24, 1931.

Joseph F. Matts to be postmaster at Verona, Wis., in place of J. F. Matts. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Mathias F. Adler to be postmaster at Waunakee, Wis., in place of M. F. Adler. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1931.

Adolph C. Sveen to be postmaster at Westby, Wis., in place of A. C. Sveen. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

WYOMING

George J. Snyder to be postmaster at Glendo, Wyo., in place of G. J. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expires February 26, 1931.

Frank F. Bristow to be postmaster at Greybull, Wyo., in place of C. M. FitzMaurice, deceased.

Reuben A. Faulk to be postmaster at Lusk, Wyo., in place of R. A. Faulk. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we pray in the name of Him who is the companion and friend of our common day; who came to preach good tidings to the poor; who went about doing good; who identified Himself with the races of men; who came to make earth happier and to deepen, broaden, and enrich human life. We pray in the name of Him who bends above us as the angel of our Father's face. O God, then in the name of Him touch the great heart of the Republic and glorify it with a service that shall bring radiant hope to the humblest citizen of our land. Through generous sacrifice stay the ravages of misfortune ere it continues its weary work. Yes, blessed Lord, hear us; open the heart of the entire country lest there be no music to charm away the fateful dreams of the poor and unfortunate. We pray in the name of Him who died in the majesty of His wonderful sacrificial love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 318. An act for the relief of William S. McWilliams;
- H. R. 566. An act for the relief of Charles Smith;
- H. R. 589. An act for the relief of Abram H. Johnson;
- H. R. 780. An act for the relief of George Selby;
- H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Mary Neaf.
- H. R. 1526. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Hayden;
- H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of William Parish;
- H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Joseph Pulitzer;
- H. R. 2584. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Sutton;
- H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of Anna E. Stratton;
- H. R. 3368. An act for the relief of Joseph Marko;
- H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of William L. Wiles;
- H. R. 4731. An act for the relief of Frederick Rasmussen;
- H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Joseph Bratten;

- H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Mary L. Dickson;
- H. R. 5926. An act for the relief of Lillian N. Lakin;
- H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Alma Rawson;
- H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance it flows through Athens County, Ohio;

- H. R. 9215. An act for the relief of Jessie Axton;
- H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

- H. R. 10017. An act to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

- H. R. 10542. An act for the relief of John A. Arnold;
- H. R. 10652. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase land and to construct buildings and facilities suitable for radio-research investigations;

- H. R. 11268. An act for the relief of Mary C. Bolling;
- H. R. 11820. An act to authorize issuance of a patent for certain lands to J. R. Murphy;

- H. R. 12094. An act to provide for conveyance of certain lands in the State of Alabama to vocational or other educational uses, or to dispose of the lands upon condition that they shall be used for such purposes;

- H. R. 12284. An act to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie;

- H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters;
- H. R. 15064. An act to reserve 440 acres of public-domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif.;

- H. R. 15267. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the cancellation, under certain conditions, of patents in fee simple to Indians for allotments held in trust by the United States";

- H. R. 15877. An act to authorize exchanges of land with owners of private-land holdings within the Craters of the Moon National Monument;

- H. R. 16159. An act authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000 to defray the expenses of the Pan American Commercial Commerce, to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1931;

- H. R. 16215. An act authorizing the sale of surplus power developed under the Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado;

- H. R. 16248. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Co. lands on the Virginia shore of the Potomac River near the west end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge; and

- H. R. 16913. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii," approved March 10, 1924.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 458. An act for the relief of Catherine Panturis;
- H. R. 504. An act for the relief of James Earl Brigman;
- H. R. 506. An act for the relief of Patrick P. Riley;
- H. R. 2694. An act conferring the rank, pay, and allowances of a major of Infantry to date from March 24, 1928, upon Robert Graham Moss, late captain, Infantry, United States Army, deceased;

- H. R. 3187. An act for the relief of Agnes Loupinas;
- H. R. 3820. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916;

- H. R. 8812. An act authorizing the Menominee Tribe of Indians to employ general attorneys;

- H. R. 14922. An act to amend the acts approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia traffic acts, etc.; and

- H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution to change the name of B Street NW., in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 229. An act for the relief of August R. Lundstrom;
- S. 988. An act for the relief of Franz J. Jonitz, first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army;
- S. 1412. An act for the relief of Stanislaus Siemek;
- S. 1617. An act for the relief of Abraham Green;
- S. 2977. An act for the refund of estate tax erroneously collected;
- S. 3463. An act to extend the admiralty laws of the United States of America to the Virgin Islands;
- S. 3867. An act for the relief of William J. Clark;
- S. 4105. An act for the relief of the estate of White B. Miller;
- S. 4321. An act for the relief of the confederated bands of Ute Indians, located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico;
- S. 4382. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Sanford, widow of William Richard Sanford, deceased;
- S. 4384. An act to provide for the erection of a suitable monument to the memory of the first permanent settlement of the West at Harrodsburg, Ky.;
- S. 4391. An act for the relief of John Herink;
- S. 4751. An act for the relief of Lester Swanberg;
- S. 5029. An act to amend the act providing for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia;
- S. 5033. An act to authorize an appropriation of tribal funds to purchase certain privately owned lands within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.;
- S. 5059. An act to reinstate Lawrence L. Myatt and Miller S. Burgin as midshipmen in the United States Naval Academy;
- S. 5215. An act for the relief of H. L. Todd;
- S. 5219. An act for the relief of John A. Pearce;
- S. 5353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Herman M. Warr;
- S. 5475. An act for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co. and George D. Mansfield;
- S. 5782. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Maumee River at or near its mouth, in Lucas County, Ohio;
- S. 5789. An act for the relief of the United States Hammered Piston Ring Co.;
- S. 5839. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton;
- S. 5854. An act to extend the provisions of the forest exchange law to certain lands adjacent to the Cascade National Forest in Oregon;
- S. 5979. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of the Eastern Emigrant and Western Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma and North Carolina;
- S. 5987. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont.;
- S. 5989. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional land for enlarging the Capitol Grounds;
- S. 6005. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Scappoose Bay, Columbia River, Oreg.;
- S. 6011. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain land in California for addition to the Cahuilla Indian Reservation, and issuance of a patent to the band of Indians therefor;
- S. 6018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.;
- S. 6045. An act authorizing D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of New Boston, Ill.;
- S. 6064. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;
- S. 6072. An act for the relief of C. H. Price;
- S. 6105. An act to authorize the construction on Government Island, Alameda, Calif., of buildings required by the Bureau of Public Roads and Forest Service of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture and the Coast Guard of the Treasury Department;

S. 6113. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

S. 6119. An act to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly; and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider, adjust, and settle the claim of the Indiana State Militia for military service on the Mexican border.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, the bill (H. R. 16738) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. KENDRICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4051) entitled "An act authorizing the Pillager Bands of Chippewa Indians, residing in the State of Minnesota, to submit claims to the Court of Claims."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9110) entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and providing compensation therefor."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16415) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11635. An act to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. COUZENS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FESS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. DILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 4619. An act to authorize the disposition of effects of persons dying while subject to military law; and

S. 4636. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to resell the undisposed-of portion of Camp Taylor, Ky., approximately 328 acres, and to also authorize the appraisal of property disposed of under authority contained in the acts of Congress approved July 9, 1918, and July 11, 1919, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. MOSES as a conferee on the part of the Senate, on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16110) entitled, "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes," vice Mr. BORAH, excused.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. FESS and Mr. ASHURST members of

the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital.

THE WICKERSHAM COMMISSION BLAZES THE TRAIL FOR THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by me last week at a Lincoln Day banquet in Boston, the subject of the speech being "The Wickersham Commission Blazes the Trail for the Republican Party."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an address delivered by me at the Lincoln Day banquet of the Middlesex Club, in Boston, on February 12, 1931.

The address is as follows:

It is more or less customary upon an anniversary like this to appeal to the spirit of Abraham Lincoln for guidance in settling our political problems. People try to surmise on what side in our controversies Lincoln would be found if he were alive to-day. Advocates of this or that cite him as favoring their particular nostrums. Opponents of this or that claim that he would agree with their antipathies. But I think you will agree that this is a rather presumptuous procedure (unless you believe in the ouija board and clairvoyants) and that the best help we can get from Lincoln in our political quarrels is in emulating the patience and moderation and simple honesty that he used in dealing with the tragic problems of his time.

We have a good many tormenting problems to-day, but fortunately none as tragic as those which Lincoln had to face. God knows it would be well for the peace and stability and happiness of this country if we could deal with these problems dispassionately, with an honest effort to understand both sides, and without thought of political or personal advantage; in a word, if we could deal with them as Abraham Lincoln would. We might well apply his spirit to a great many of our contentious issues, to drought relief, to farm relief, to the so-called bonus, to Muscle Shoals, to the World Court, to disarmament, to power control, to railroad consolidations, to taxes. Men wrangle and get angry about all of these questions, and politicians dodge and evade, and we have not as much calm, clear, honest thinking about them as we ought to have.

THE MALADY OF PROHIBITION

But there is one issue which overshadows all others in the minds of the public and the politicians, in the settlement of which the spirit of Lincoln would be particularly helpful to-day. That is the issue of the great experiment which our people undertook in the closing days of the great World War, and which to-day, 12 years after its adoption, absorbs more attention and provokes more bitter debate than all of the other issues combined. We are in the position of a business man or a lawyer suffering from a painful and lingering disease. Much as we would like to give attention to other matters of moment, it is almost impossible to do so until we are relieved of this distracting and nerve-racking malady.

We are victims of it. We can't escape it. It glares at us from the headlines and cartoons and editorials of the papers we read at breakfast. It jumps at us from the pages of every weekly or magazine we read at night. It influences our choice of friends and our estimates of our fellow men. We choose men for office not because of their ability, experience, and knowledge but because of their attitude on this one issue. And because of it, the men we choose for office are unable to devote their minds and energies freely either to the great problems of industrial organization upon which the future of our country depends, or to the problems of our foreign relations upon which the peace of the world depends. The noble experiment has become a great malady, impairing the vision, obsessing the mind, and distracting the nervous energies of the Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

Well, when an individual is so afflicted, the wise policy to follow is to call in a number of specialists for consultation, ask them to diagnose the case, find out what is wrong, and recommend a remedy. That is just what President Hoover has done for this malady. At the very outset of his administration he summoned 10 men and 1 woman from different parts of the country, all of the highest standing in their professions, several of them judges, one a former Attorney General, one a former Secretary of War, one a former chief justice of a State supreme court, one the dean of one of the country's leading law schools, another president of one of the leading colleges for women, and he asked them to make "an accurate determination of fact and cause" and to follow that with "constructive, courageous conclusions." Those were his exact words.

For more than a year and a half these 11 consultants have devoted themselves to the task. They in turn have employed other experts to collect facts, have examined witnesses, have consulted reports, memoranda, books, and scholarly studies of every sort, and less than a month ago they presented their diagnosis and recommendations to the President and through him to Congress and the country. There have been a good many sneers and puns directed at the report of the Wickersham Commission, but in my judgment, when the tumult and shouting are over, and the jokesters have had their say, the commission's report will be recognized as one of the most thorough, and one of the most fair and dispassionate presentations that has ever been made of a burning problem.

THE DECEPTIVE SUMMARY

Unfortunately, some one in a position of responsibility did a very unfair and vandalistic thing to that report. They appended at the end of the report a 2-page summary of its supposed conclusions which was utterly inadequate and misleading in trend, and they gave this deceptive summary to the press before anyone had had time to read the text of the report. It is hard to believe that either this supposed summary, or the way in which it was given to the public, could have had the approval of the distinguished jurists and scholars who signed the report. But, be that as it may, it has left throughout the country a confused and false impression of the general tenor of the commission's conclusions. I hope that every man and woman interested in this great problem (and who is not?) will read the full report, both the joint report and the individual statements of each of the 11 members. They tell in language that he who runs may read and understand the deliberate opinions of the 11 distinguished commissioners whom Mr. Hoover appointed under authority of Congress to study national prohibition.

Because, however, many of you have probably not yet found time to study the actual report, and because of the confusion due to the wide dissemination of the deceptive summary, and because I consider the report itself the most masterful and scholarly contribution that has ever been made to our most discussed problem, I hope you will permit me to-night to review and analyze its most important findings. In doing so I shall even have to ask your indulgence in allowing me to read some passages from its text.

AGREEMENTS UPON EVIDENCE

I think that you will all agree that if those 11 members, starting as they did with different preconceptions and opinions, have arrived at virtual unanimity upon any of the issues involved, our people would do well to accept their findings as a basis for action, and if a predominant majority of them agree upon certain recommendations as a result of their findings such recommendations are entitled to our most open-minded and serious consideration.

First of all, I am going to direct your attention to four groups of findings of major importance upon which all of the commissioners are agreed. These findings are of such consequence that at the risk of boring you I am going to confirm them by textual quotations from the joint report.

(a) Lack of public support

First. The commissioners unanimously agreed that the eighteenth amendment can not be made to succeed without the support of public opinion. This is what they say in the joint report: "From the beginning ours has been a government of public opinion. We expect legislation to conform to public opinion, not public opinion to yield to legislation. Whether public opinion at a given time and on a given subject is right or wrong is not a question which, according to American ideas, may be settled by the words 'Be it enacted'" (p. 48).

"It is axiomatic that under any system of reasonably free government a law will be observed and may be enforced only when and to the extent that it reflects or is an expression of the general opinion of the normally law-abiding elements of the community" (p. 49).

I ask you to bear in mind, then, that the commission agrees that a law can not be enforced unless it is effectively supported by the general opinion of the community. For the commission also agrees that large-scale lukewarmness or actual hostility toward the eighteenth amendment exist in many cities and States and among a significant part of the public everywhere. Here is what they say:

"Many of the best citizens in every community on whom we rely habitually for the upholding of law and order are at most lukewarm as to the national prohibition act. Many who are normally law-abiding are led to an attitude hostile to the statute by a feeling that repression and interference with private conduct are carried too far" (p. 54).

But this is not all. The commissioners also concur in the opinion that public support of national prohibition, instead of growing stronger, is becoming weaker as the years pass. Here are the exact words of the joint report—

"From its inception to the present time the law has been to a constantly increasing degree deprived of that support in public opinion which was and is essential for its general observance or effective enforcement" (p. 51).

And they add that—

"Adverse public opinion in some States and lukewarm public opinion with strong hostile elements in other States are obstinate facts which can not be coerced by any measures of enforcement tolerable under our polity" (p. 49).

Those are not my words. They are the words of the commissioners in the report to which they all subscribe. They declare that the amendment can not succeed without the support of public opinion, and that such support is seriously lacking and steadily diminishing. Is it possible for any reasonable human being to draw any other than one conclusion from such premises?

(b) *Lack of State cooperation*

Second. The commissioners unanimously agree that the amendment can not succeed without the cooperation of the States. The textual words of the joint report declare:

"It is generally admitted and indeed has been demonstrated by experience that State cooperation is necessary to effective enforcement" (p. 59).

Bear that in mind also, for the commissioners unanimously agree that this cooperation has been, and still is, wanting in many States, and what is more to the point they agree that State cooperation is being withdrawn year after year. They tell us that eight States, containing a fourth of the entire population of the United States, either have no State enforcement laws or have already voted to repeal them, and that other States are contemplating similar action. I quote once more from the joint report:

"In 1923 the New York Legislature repealed its prohibition act. In the same year Nevada repealed its statute * * *. Montana repealed its prohibition law in 1926, Wisconsin its law in 1929, and Massachusetts its law by referendum in 1930. In 1930 the people of Illinois and Rhode Island voted for repeal of their State laws" (p. 39).

But you ask how about the other States? The joint report declares that—

"There has been in recent years a growing tendency, even in States with prohibition laws, to let the Federal Government carry the burden of enforcement" (p. 39).

And they cite in this connection the State of Kansas, which has had State prohibition for over 50 years, and they show that even in Kansas prohibition is not being as well enforced as it was before the national enactment. Let me read you something that they say apropos of the relaxation of State enforcement in that prohibition pioneering State:

"It is significant that the death rate in Kansas from alcoholism and causes attributable to alcohol, which had fallen to a very low level between 1917 and 1920, has risen to the level of 1917" (p. 41).

Perhaps the most compact summing up of the commission's thought upon the present condition of State cooperation throughout the country is to be found in the statement on page 59, that—

"As things are at present, there is virtual local option."

(c) *Home control impossible*

Third. The commissioners agree that the amendment can not be effectively enforced unless control can be exercised over manufacture of beverages in people's homes. They say that home brewing, home wine making, and home distilling run easily into commercial manufacture, and that this must be checked if the purposes of prohibition are to be achieved.

This is significant also, for they proceed to admit that it is practically impossible to enforce the law in 20,000,000 homes, and that it is inadvisable to attempt it as such "invasion of the homes and interference with family life" inevitably arouse resentment (p. 33). "Necessity," they say on page 33, "seems to compel the virtual abandonment of efforts for effective enforcement at this point." * * * "Law," they add, "here bows to actualities," even though it involves nullification.

(d) *Bootleg profits*

Fourth. The commissioners agree that the eighteenth amendment can not succeed so long as the illicit importation, illicit distilling, and illicit sale of liquor, etc., yield large-scale profits.

This, too, is an admission of consequence, for the commissioners find, with regard to illicit importation, that smugglers of liquor (I quote their exact words) "can operate profitably if they can land one boatload of five" (p. 24). With regard to unlawful manufacturing, they find that illicit distilleries "if operated but a short time, pay for themselves and begin to make large profits" (p. 29) and that "even when Federal and State authorities join in a zealous campaign of enforcement, they have been unable to keep up with the setting up and operation of these unlawful plants" (p. 29). As for bootlegging and unlawful sale, their conclusion is that "organized distribution has outstripped organized enforcement" (p. 37), and they further conclude from the evidence which they have collected that "systematic and organized violation of the national prohibition act * * * offers rewards on a par with the most important legitimate industries" (p. 51). The profit is such, the commission observes, as to "make lavish expenditure in corruption possible. It puts heavy temptation in the way of everyone engaged in enforcement or administration of the law. It affords a financial basis for organized crime" (p. 52).

These four groups of findings which I have just quoted are drawn from the joint report. They are opinions in which all of the commissioners concur, and they all converge with syllogistic logic toward one conclusion which is concentrated in two paragraphs in the closing pages of their report. Let me quote these paragraphs:

"The statute [meaning national prohibition] has been in force for a decade with large majorities in Congress pledged to give effect to it, and militant organizations pushing to that end.

There has been more sustained pressure to enforce this law than on the whole has been true of any other Federal statute. * * * No other Federal law has had such elaborate State and Federal enforcing machinery put behind it" (p. 79).

Yet, and I still quote from the report—

"No improvement in machinery will avail without cooperation from the States. * * * So long as public opinion is adverse or indifferent in large cities and in many States, so long as there is no practicable means of reaching home manufacture (which may easily run into commercial manufacture), and so long as the margin of profit remains what it is, serious obstacles in the way of satisfactory enforcement will continue to be beyond the reach of improved organization, personnel, and equipment, and tightened statutory and administrative provisions" (p. 80).

These quotations are all from the joint report subscribed to by all of the commissioners. In briefer words, the commission as a whole, "bowing to actualities," regretfully recognizes that, under conditions as they are, the eighteenth amendment is not enforceable. This is the quintessence—the very kernel—of the Wickersham commission's report, but it was not even mentioned in the deceptive summary which was broadcast to the American public through the press.

AGREEMENTS UPON CONCLUSIONS

Let us next see to what extent the 11 commissioners meet the inexorable logic of their finding. How far do they agree as to what should now be done?

The deceptive summary misleadingly states that "some" of the commission believe that a further trial should be made, and that "others" are convinced that the amendment should be revised. It conveys not the slightest indication that the commissioners are other than evenly divided, much less that an outstanding majority have concurred in their verdict. It even seems to deny that any of them favor repeal. At this point we may well leave behind both the deceptive summary and the joint report and turn to the individual statements of the 11 commissioners. Let us call the roll:

The chairman, Mr. Wickersham, of New York: "I believe that there should be further trial."

Judge Grubb, of Birmingham, Ala.: "I agree that there should be further trial."

Judge Kenyon, of Iowa: "I think that there should be reasonable further trial."

Judge McCormick, of Los Angeles: "There should be further trial, but one year would be a reasonable time."

Judge Mackintosh, of Seattle: "The time has come to take the next step. The amendment should be changed, constitutional prohibition should be abandoned, and Federal control substituted."

President Comstock, of Cambridge: "I favor an immediate attempt at change."

Dean Pound, of Cambridge: "National prohibition should be abandoned. I fear that unless immediate revision of the amendment takes place all that we have gained will be lost."

Colonel Anderson, of Richmond, Va.: "We can not ignore the appalling conditions which this commission has found to exist and to be steadily growing worse. The time has arrived for revision of the amendment."

Mr. Loesch, of Chicago: "Steps should be taken immediately to remove prohibition from the Constitution and to revise the amendment."

Former Secretary of War Baker, of Cleveland: "The eighteenth amendment should be repealed and the whole question remitted to the States."

Mr. Lemann, of New Orleans: "I see no alternative but repeal of the amendment."

Summing up the vote, 7 out of 11 of the commissioners, a large majority, yield to the force of evidence and recommend that without further delay national prohibition be taken out of the Constitution. A small minority, the remaining four, believe that it should still be given a little longer trial. Judge McCormick considers one more year sufficient. The others do not specify the period of further probation. But every one of them admits the strong possibility that sooner or later the abandonment of national prohibition may prove inevitable. Thus the verdict of the commission, clearly affirmed by seven of its members, and not confidently opposed by the other four, is that the eighteenth amendment in its present form ought to be removed from the Constitution.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ENFORCEMENT

The fact that the commission offer several recommendations for improving enforcement does not in the least mitigate the force of this conclusion. They all recognize that the process of repealing or changing the amendment will take some time. Besides they were virtually instructed to make such recommendations by the congressional statute under which they were appointed, which, as a matter of fact, limited their whole inquiry to "enforcement." In compliance with these instructions, although showing that satisfactory enforcement has never existed and remains a practical impossibility, they could do no less than formulate suggestions for improving enforcement in case the effort is to continue. Some of these suggestions look toward making enforcement less objectionable, some toward making it more effective. Curiously enough, their first recommendation for improved enforcement is to remove the legal limitations upon doctors' prescriptions, and another is against any stiffening up of searches and seizures. They, however, propose a 60 per cent increase in enforcement personnel,

suggest doing away with trial by jury in petty cases, advise a closer scrutiny of industrial alcohol, and think it might be helpful to codify the various liquor laws now on the statute books. If their recommendations seem half-hearted and defeatist, it is not surprising in view of their previous finding that the policy of national prohibition is fundamentally unworkable.

The yielding of the Wickersham Commission to Congress in thus making suggestions for enforcement, when most of them think that enforcement is impossible, reminds one of a reported conversation between a dentist and a Scotchman suffering from an ulcerated tooth. It pained the Scotchman horribly, and he turned to the dentist for relief. The dentist advised: "There is only one way to cure you. Have your tooth pulled." "How much will it cost, doctor?" inquired the Scotchman. "Fifteen dollars," was the reply. "Well, doctor," said the Scotchman, "I think I will only ask you to loosen it a little." Congress wanted the Wickersham Commission to "only loosen it a little," and the commission complied, although they strongly advised "extraction."

REVISION OR REPEAL

Nor is the substance of the commission's conclusion altered by some of them calling their proposal for dealing with the eighteenth amendment "revision" rather than "repeal." The eighteenth amendment consists of just three paragraphs or sections. The first paragraph makes national prohibition mandatory. It prohibits the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, and exportation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. This first paragraph, a majority of the commission agree, should be eliminated. The second paragraph provides for concurrent State and National enforcement. This second paragraph the entire commission without exception would eliminate (p. 82). The third and remaining paragraph concerns only the terms under which the eighteenth amendment was to be ratified, and has no present significance.

So it remains true that in the opinion of a majority of the commission the entire amendment ought to be done away with. The fact that most of them favor the adoption of a substitute or superseding amendment giving Congress a free hand to legislate about intoxicating liquors as they may see fit, leaves it still true that they advocate the repeal of constitutional prohibition. By the use of the softer word "revision," there can be no question that they have given to the medicine a coating likely to make it more palatable to Congress and a certain section of the public.

STATE CONTROL

I want to call to your attention another and still more significant fact. Even those commissioners who believe that Congress should be allowed to exercise some measure of supervision over intoxicating liquors in the future, are none the less convinced that mandatory prohibition should have no place in the Constitution, that the attempt to enforce universal total abstinence should be abandoned, and that freedom of initiative in dealing with the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors should be restored to the States.

In confirmation of this statement, permit me to read you some of the things which the whole commission are agreed should be brought to pass in case revision is possible. I quote their exact words from the closing page of the joint report. They believe that we should "do away with the absolute rigidity of the amendment as it stands" (p. 81), and should "give scope for trying out further plans" (p. 81). They would go so far as to "permit, when demanded by public opinion, an honest, general, or local control of manufacture, or importation, or distribution" (p. 81). They hold that "local systems of control" would "do away with the enormous margin of profit which is at the bottom of widespread corruption and general lawlessness" (p. 81); and mark well what I am next going to read, they would "allow of adjustment to local public opinion so as to do away with . . . the attempt to force an extreme measure of universal total abstinence on communities where public opinion is strongly opposed thereto" (p. 81). Let me repeat, the commission as a whole at the end of their joint report advise abandoning the attempt to force universal total abstinence upon communities that do not want it, and also advise the restoration of some measure of local control over manufacture, importation, and sale. This is their final verdict upon the eighteenth amendment, and no verdict could be more clear.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

After 19 months of intensive study, the commission which President Hoover appointed to investigate this great problem, and which he hoped, as he expressed it, would follow their inquiry with "constructive, courageous conclusions," have arrived at that hoped-for goal. They courageously conclude (at least the great majority of them do) that mandatory national prohibition, which 11 years ago was incorporated in the Constitution of the United States as the eighteenth amendment, ought now to be taken out of that immortal document.

If we recognize the President's wisdom in appointing this commission, if we believe that the members whom he selected are, as he described them, "able," "representative," "citizens of character and independence of thought," if we agree that they have faithfully and thoroughly performed their task, then as loyal supporters of the President, we ought to respect the findings of his commission and try to translate them into action.

The party to which we give our allegiance has never failed our country in a critical hour. In the first decade of its existence, under the guidance of Abraham Lincoln, it solved the problem of

human slavery and kept all the stars in our flag. In the seventies it rid the country of the curse of greenbackism. In the nineties it saved us from the menace of debased coinage and preserved the gold standard. A decade ago it saved us from committing our Government to future entanglement in European quarrels, which would have involved us in countless wars.

That same glorious party, which we revere for all that it has done for our beloved country in the past, can not be allowed to fall us to-day in settling the most tormenting controversy of our time. If we, as Republicans, can but sit down together, not in angry debate, not in bitter contention, but inspired by the patient, calm spirit of Abraham Lincoln, we are now in a position to accomplish the solution of this great problem also. President Hoover's commission has blazed the trail. We have only to follow on. If we do so, we shall add one more great service rendered by our party to the peace and happiness and freedom of these United States.

EFFECT OF THE OIL DEPRESSION ON LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD statistics showing the effect of the oil depression on labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statistics by T. F. Hunter, Wichita Falls, Tex., showing the effect of the oil depression on labor:

Economic conditions are reflected by labor employment. Unemployment is in every instance the result of lack of money circulation. It therefore may be caused by the ills of one basic industry, and at the same time be sharply felt in all industries. The lost buying power of any group necessarily reflects itself into all groups.

The American people, by means of protection, have established a high standard of living. That standard should be maintained. Our people are interested in prosperity. They have lived as freemen, holding themselves from bondage or equivalent peonage. We can not continue this standard half protected. The prosperity of any group enures by its buying power to the other; it is equally true that the misery of any group or the destruction of any basic industry by its nonbuying power seriously and permanently reflects itself into all others. It is, therefore, impossible for our country to be prosperous if any of its basic industries are in distress.

So long as the oil industry is permitted to remain in its present distressed condition, the country and all its industries must suffer an economic depression, and millions of its people must go half clad and half fed. The increasing flood of foreign crude oil into the United States, with a known unlimited supply, whipped our average per barrel price of 1926 from \$1.88 to that of 93 cents, a loss in receipts to the producers of this commodity of 95 cents per barrel. For our present market outlet of 2,700,000 barrels of oil daily we now receive only \$2,511,000 per day, while the same number of barrels at the 1926 price average brought us and we should now have \$5,076,000 per day. The results are that we have lost from circulation in the sale of this commodity \$2,565,000, or the gigantic sum of \$936,235,000 loss per annum.

The importers during 1930, by their importation, held off the market 113,000,000 barrels of our oil, which, at \$1.88 per barrel, represents an added annual loss to us for this commodity of \$212,440,000. This money should be available for programs of leasing, drilling, building, and for labor. It represents one of our lost buying powers so keenly felt by other lines of business.

The oil industry in normal times carries under lease potential oil lands for which, in addition to the bonuses paid, it pays to the farmers a \$1 per acre annual rental, which under the existing conditions that can not pay, meaning a loss to the farmers as follows:

Kansas (estimated)	\$5,000,000
Texas (estimated)	12,000,000
Oklahoma	10,000,000
Louisiana	4,000,000
Arkansas	2,000,000
New Mexico	1,000,000
Colorado	1,000,000
Montana (estimated)	1,000,000
Mississippi	2,000,000
Other States	8,000,000

Estimated total annual loss, farm rentals. 46,000,000

To these farmer and fee-owner losses we must add the one-eighth of the lost receipts from the sale of crude oil, or the sum of \$117,029,370; aggregating a loss by the forced depression to the farmers and fee owners of \$163,029,370. The lost buying power of the industry will no doubt result in another \$50,000,000 loss to farmers and fee owners in bonuses that would, under fair conditions, be paid them for leases.

It is estimated by high authority that more than 100,000 oil-field workmen in the mid-continent field are unemployed; that the ills of the industry are responsible for the unemployment and idleness among the allied groups and others of 150,000 workers; that in California there are 32,000 field workers unemployed, and nearly

50,000 of the allied groups and other workers unemployed by reason of the oil-field shutdown; that there are among field workers, allied groups, and others affected in other industries throughout other producing areas of more than 50,000 men. Taking these figures for the unemployed and \$7 per day as the average wage, we find that there is on account of the forced depression of this industry cost to the wage earners of the country \$1,974,000 per day, or the tremendous sum of \$710,640,000 for the year.

Drilling contractors have invested millions of dollars in drilling rigs and machinery now lying idle, stacked in warehouses and in open weather, deteriorating, out of use, and without immediate prospects for contracts. The shutdown in the industry and the lack of contracts and of immediate prospects for the resumption of drilling has lost to these contractors more than 60 per cent of the normal market value of this type of used machinery. In fact, it is a drag upon the market, and there is now little sale value for it.

It is estimated by executives of the organized carpenters that in some centers only about 10 per cent of their men are working. Other building trades are like affected.

The oil-field shutdown has now lasted so long that these unemployed men and their families are destitute and nonbuyers. Being such, their plight is reflected on the merchants and wholesalers, and they in turn have released from employment thousands of men. These unemployed are living, in many instances, in crowded conditions and in tents, reflecting upon the landlords and the apartment-house owners, the boarding houses, and restaurants.

Oil-well casing, tubing, rods, and oil-well supplies, under normal conditions, afforded the railroad companies a large per cent of tonnage. Fuel oil, gasoline, and other refined products marketed by interior refiners likewise afforded railroads a large per cent of their tonnage. The cheap water transportation available to importers of refined products to centers along the Atlantic coast and along the Mississippi have materially reduced the railroad hauls. The nonbuying power of the unemployed has likewise reduced the railroad hauls. It is, therefore, evident that the unemployed railroad workmen are idle in a large measure as a result of the unemployed oil-field workers and because of the nonbuying power created by them.

Oil-field workmen are necessarily users of automobiles, and because of the unfavorable road conditions and the nature of the use of their cars, the average life of a car is but little more than 12 months. They are, therefore, when working, heavy users of tires and automobile accessories. Their idleness and their nonbuying power has, therefore, caused many thousands of workmen in automobile factories and in manufactures of automobile tires to become unemployed and idle. The same course of reasoning is true with reference to the manufactures of wearing apparel, manila ropes, belting, and of other articles too numerous to mention.

This nonbuying power and its effect upon merchants and other branches of industry has had a far-reaching effect upon the plight of the farmer and the producers of meats. These multiplied thousands of men and their families are existing upon cheap food, and in many thousands of cases this food is being furnished through charity.

The oil industry offers one of the greatest outlets for the steel mills. Multiplied thousands of carloads of casing, tubing, rods, drilling machinery, and well-equipment supplies are used each year. The reduced buying power of the industry has pulled from these mills thousands of their workmen.

Major companies, as a general rule, have found that it is more profitable and more economical to employ independent contractors to drill their wells for oil, since independent contractors, owning, in thousands of instances, only from one to five drilling rigs, are able to personally supervise on the ground the drilling and the completion of these wells, and are therefore able to drill them under contract with a fair profit, cheaper than the major companies can drill and complete them for themselves. These thousands of contractors and well-machinery owners are idle, among the unemployed, and are nonbuyers.

These importers have constructed and are operating enormous refineries beyond the limits of the United States. The laborers of these foreign countries are used to produce the by-products of crude petroleum.

More than 700,000,000 gallons of gasoline thus refined in foreign countries was imported into the United States during the year 1930.

During the first half of the year 1929, 4,024 wells were drilled in the State of Texas. During the first half of the year 1930 only 2,461 wells were drilled, showing the decrease in the number of wells drilled as 1,563. While we do not know the exact average cost of wells in Texas, we adopt the figure of \$20,000 as the estimated average cost of wells now being drilled in that State. If that amount is correct, then on the basis of the first half for the year 1930 there was lost in moneys paid to contractors as compared with that for 1929 the sum of \$62,500,000. It is reasonable to presume that with oil selling at its present price that the average number of wells drilled per month during the year 1931 will be much less than that for 1930, and the loss in monies paid to the contractors will be much greater.

There are now producing in Texas thousands of marginal or stripper wells being produced at a loss and unless relief is given these operators quickly those wells will be abandoned and plugged. If they are, millions of barrels of reserve oil will be lost and

thousands of workmen engaged in the operation of these wells will be forced among the unemployed. The same condition exists in all oil-producing States and unless relief is had operators and workmen in those States will suffer the same consequence.

Five hundred thousand barrels of oil per day or more are produced from wells producing less than three barrels daily. These wells and leases represent a property value to their owners of more than \$1,000,000, which property value will, unless they are protected, be a total loss.

It may be claimed by some that this justly deserved protection would raise the price of gasoline and lubricating oils to the consumer. If we may judge the future by the past, that will not be the case. During the last 12 years the price of crude oil in the United States has ranged from near \$4 per barrel to 93 cents per barrel. Nevertheless, the price per quart of the leading grades of lubricating oils has remained the same. Nor has the price of gasoline fluctuated with that of crude. You have figures showing that in 52 cities big company-controlled consumers paid more for gasoline with crude at \$1.20 per barrel than they did with it at \$2.04 per barrel.

Since these hearings have been going on there has been a posted cut in the price of oil. Almost simultaneously with that cut the same companies raised the price of gasoline to the consumers.

Again we would cite you to countries, big-company controlled, where no independent competition exists. In Peru gasoline sells as high as 60 cents per gallon. In East Indies gasoline sells at 36 cents to 42 cents per gallon. In Persia it sells in bulk for as much as 50 cents per gallon. Yet we are amazed to find that the same monopolistic controls that fix these prices load their gasoline aboard ships and compete with our independents in protected America on a 4-cents-per-gallon bulk price. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that the restriction of the amount of imports would not affect the price of gasoline to the consumer. On the other hand, we have positive proof that the elimination of independent competition will materially affect that price.

The oil producers in our country are by commission rule and by necessity prorated to as low as 3 per cent of the potential of their large flush fields. It is nothing but right, it is nothing but fair, that the importers from large flush fields of the foreign countries be prorated as we are prorated. It is not fair, nor is it just, that these rich and powerful combines produce oil in foreign countries by foreign labor, dump it on our market unrestricted, while our operators are restricted, our workmen unemployed and in want. An emergency exists. We submit that this relief should be given attention immediately.

This importation of oil has taken the sustenance of life from more than 300,000 American citizens. They, their wives, and children are destitute. These women and children are in crowded conditions, half fed, and scantily clad, in many instances by charity, while their providers search in vain for employment.

Hunger knows no law. You who have never walked the roads in hunger without the price of a sandwich are unable to see the picture that such a one sees. But as one who has walked that road, slept in the haystack and on the ground by the campfire, I say to you that it is most serious. It is time that we give to them the protection that they are entitled to and that which so many others enjoy.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have until to-morrow at noon within which to file minority views on the resolution (H. J. Res. 500) further restricting for a period of two years immigration into the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 17163) (Rept. No. 2712) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BYRNS reserved all points of order.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments

and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and to appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SIMMONS, HOLADAY, THATCHER, CANNON, and COLLINS.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate (except 21 and 24) to the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29, 42, 43, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 69, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For establishing and equipping a Coast Guard station at or near Port Orford on the coast of Oregon as authorized in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. p. 938), to be immediately available, \$83,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$32,606,422"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$397,984"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$1,102,090"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$1,576,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$540,240"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,640"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$207,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILL R. WOOD,
M. H. THATCHER,
GUY U. HARDY,
GEO. A. WELSH,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
WILLIAM W. ARNOLD,

Managers on the part of the House.

L. C. PHIPPS,
REED SMOOT,
GEO. H. MOSES,
WM. J. HARRIS,
CARTER GLASS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate, except Nos. 21 and 24 already concurred in by the House, to the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On No. 5: Strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, excepting electrically powered typewriting machines, from the price limitations imposed by the bill for the purchase of standard typewriting machines.

On No. 28: Appropriates \$83,500 for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Port Orford, Oreg., instead of \$143,500, as proposed by the Senate, to include stations at or near Grand Island, Mich., and on the coast of Green Bay, Wis.

On No. 29: Makes the appropriation for construction of the Coast Guard academy "immediately available," as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 42 and 43: Restores to the bill, as proposed by the Senate, the assay offices at Carson City, Nev., Boise, Idaho, Helena, Mont., and Salt Lake City, Utah.

On No. 60: Appropriates \$53,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$53,500,000 as proposed by the House, for compensation of postmasters.

On No. 61: Appropriates \$8,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,700,000, as proposed by the House, for allowances to third-class post offices to cover the cost of clerical services.

On No. 62: Appropriates \$1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,600,000, as proposed by the House, for village delivery service.

On No. 63: Appropriates \$1,400,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,450,000, as proposed by the House, for car fare and bicycle allowances.

On Nos. 64 and 65: Strikes out the increase of \$345,000, proposed by the Senate, in the allotment for carrying foreign mail by aircraft under contract.

On No. 66: Strikes out the increase of \$750,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for transportation of domestic mail by aircraft under contract.

On No. 68: Strikes out the limitation, inserted by the Senate, prohibiting the payment of rentals for quarters for the housing of Government-owned vehicles in the Postal Service unless the leases therefor have been entered into in accordance with the conditions specified in the amendment.

On No. 69: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, section 4 of the House bill which prohibited the use of appropriations in the bill for making administrative increases in salary by taking advantage of savings in appropriations accruing from lapses, etc.

On the following 46 amendments dealing exclusively with salary increases the Senate has receded in accordance with the procedure adopted for other appropriation bills and such increases are accordingly eliminated in these amendments,

Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, and 67.

The following seven amendments involved salary increases along with other purposes. As to each of these amendments the Senate has receded from the salary increase portion of the amendment and the action of the managers on the rest of the matter involved in each of such amendments is as follows:

On No. 30: Corrects the total amount for the Coast Guard.

On No. 34: Increases the House appropriation for "pay of acting assistant surgeons," Public Health Service, by \$2,200, as proposed by the Senate, to cover quarantine inspection of trains coming in from Mexico.

On No. 35: Increases the House appropriation for "pay of all other employees," Public Health Service, by \$3,600, as proposed by the Senate, to cover quarantine inspection of trains coming in from Mexico.

On No. 44: Increases the House appropriation for mints and assay offices by \$25,820, as proposed by the Senate, to comport with action submitted under amendments 42 and 43 in restoring four assay offices to the bill.

On No. 52: Increases the appropriation for salaries, office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, by \$5,240, as proposed by the Senate, to provide for additional employees.

On No. 56: Increases the appropriation for salaries, office of the Solicitor for the Post Office Department, by \$12,320, as proposed by the Senate, to provide for additional employees.

On No. 57: Increases the appropriation for salaries, office of the chief inspector, Post Office Department, by \$12,300, as proposed by the Senate, to provide for additional employees.

WILL R. WOOD,
GUY U. HARDY,
GEO. A. WELSH,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
WILLIAM W. ARNOLD,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I may say the conferees of the House and the conferees of the Senate are in complete agreement on this report, and I move the adoption of the report.

The conference report was agreed to.

B STREET NW., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 404) to change the name of B Street NW., in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk reported the joint resolution by title and read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"That in honor of the State of Louisiana and that territory comprised in the 'Louisiana Purchase' from which 13 other sovereign States of this Union, in whole or in part, were carved, the thoroughfare running from the Union Station Plaza, crossing North Capitol Street and New Jersey and Indiana Avenues and running into Pennsylvania Avenue, shall hereafter bear the name 'Louisiana Avenue.'"

"That the portion of the avenue now known as 'Louisiana Avenue,' not absorbed by the enlarging of the park and plan system of the Planning Commission, shall no longer be known as 'Louisiana Avenue.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of B Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that it is desirable, and certainly it is not necessary to send this bill to conference, in order to dispose of the questions involved.

There is only one amendment involved, and there would be nothing to prevent the House expressing itself directly upon that amendment. If that course were followed there would be opportunity for this House to adopt any substitute it might desire, for the Senate amendment.

It happens that a year ago I offered a resolution proposing that this great boulevard to extend from Arlington Memorial Bridge to B Street and from B Street to the Union Station Plaza, should be designated as "Thomas Jefferson Boulevard."

That suggestion occurred to me for the reason that not only was Thomas Jefferson one of the preeminent figures in the period attending the birth of this Nation, connected so prominently with the Declaration of Independence, and in many other ways one of our very greatest American citizens, but in addition to that, what perhaps is not so generally appreciated, next to George Washington himself, he had more to do with the planning of the National Capital than any other man. It was to him, soon after his return from France, that Alexander Hamilton went for aid in securing the assumption by the Federal Government of the Revolutionary debts of the States, and in return, Jefferson secured location of the Nation's Capital on the Potomac. He secured in Europe the city plans which L'Enfant used in his studies, and after his return he took a lively interest in the planning and development of the new Capital. Notwithstanding those facts, his preeminence as a great American of our early period and his close and influential and helpful connection with the planning of the National Capital, there is not today any memorial to Thomas Jefferson in the National Capital.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman to say the gentleman is correct? The only thing of that character that is in the National Capital is a very minor statue of Jefferson which is in one of the corridors of this building.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is true as to the Capitol Building, but in the National Capital, generally speaking, there is no memorial to Thomas Jefferson. It seems to me it would be very fitting that this outstanding boulevard should bear his name. This House accepted the suggestion made by our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and passed a resolution which he offered, designating the boulevard that takes the place of B Street, as "Constitution Avenue." From B Street to the Union Station, it would seem to me, might most fittingly still be named for Thomas Jefferson, so that from the Union Plaza one would proceed through Thomas Jefferson Boulevard into Constitution Avenue [applause], very much in line with the actual program of history. In the Senate on yesterday, without any extensive consideration, an amendment was offered to the Cooper resolution.

It would seem to me more desirable to take up each of these matters upon their merits separately. An amendment was offered and adopted in the Senate naming this avenue from B Street to the Union Station Plaza for Louisiana. I recognize that there is a considerable degree of fitness in that. I recognize the importance of the Louisiana Purchase in the development of this Nation, but I do remember also that but for Thomas Jefferson there would have been no Louisiana Purchase. [Applause.]

I am somewhat embarrassed. I dislike to make any suggestion that would seem lacking in appreciation of the Louisiana Purchase, but it had been my thought that if this matter were taken up in the House, as it might be, and the Senate amendment given consideration, I would at least offer a substitute for the Senate amendment that the avenue from B Street to the Union Station Plaza be designated Thomas Jefferson Avenue.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In order to give the House an opportunity to express itself on the very valuable suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan, why does not he get the gentleman from Maryland to change his unanimous consent request and ask to take the matter up for consideration in the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am frank to say this, that I have no desire to overurge my own views on the question. Unless

my suggestion meets with very substantial support in the House I have no desire to press it, but if there is an interest in it I think the House ought to have a chance to express itself, and I would suggest to the gentleman from Maryland that he ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the gentleman is aware, as well as anyone in the House, that the policy followed in naming the avenues in Washington has been that of naming them after the States. In no instance have we named any of the avenues in the District after our illustrious public men—none in honor of Washington, none in honor of Lincoln, and none in honor of the later great Presidents. In other cities, like Chicago, it has been the practice to name streets and avenues after the Presidents of the United States. I was thinking that Louisiana, by reason of Jefferson's close association with the Louisiana Purchase, was rather an indirect tribute to the memory of the third President of the United States and would harmonize with the policy of naming our great avenues after States rather than after persons.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say in response to the gentleman that I can recognize the force of his suggestion with reference to Louisiana. I do submit, however, that some time, without much delay, some permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson, not indirectly through honoring one of his works, but directly through honoring him, ought to grace the National Capital.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that suggestion I heartily agree but I do not think it would be a proper testimonial to merely name an avenue after him but that there should be some fitting testimonial to him, comparable to the Lincoln Memorial or the Washington Monument.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no desire, in a crowded program, to press this matter unless, as I stated before, there is substantial support of it in the House.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. What did the Senate propose as to the present Louisiana Avenue?

Mr. CRAMTON. They just leave that nameless. The amendment revokes the present name and leaves it for the present nameless. I will withdraw my objection and I will be agreeable to any course that may be taken. The conferees may very well consider substituting "Thomas Jefferson" in the Senate amendment for "Louisiana." Or they will, in due regard to the convenience of the public, consider giving one name for the whole avenue from Union Plaza to the Arlington Memorial Bridge and accept the Cooper suggestion of Constitution Avenue for that whole great ceremonial artery. In that event later proper tribute could be paid appropriately to Thomas Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. McLEOD, and Mrs. NORTON.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ZIHLMAN submitted the conference report, for printing under the rule, on the bill (H. R. 12571) to provide for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill (H. R. 5660) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by fire in the State of Minnesota during October, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to file minority views on House bill 5660. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT—CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the conference report on House bill 9110 and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 7. That the act (Public, No. 135, 68th Cong.) approved May 24, 1924, entitled 'An act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes,' be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That hereafter the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the United States shall be known as the Foreign Service of the United States.

"SEC. 9. That the official designation "Foreign Service officers" as employed throughout this act, shall be deemed to denote permanent officers in the Foreign Service below the grade of minister, all of whom are subject to promotion on merit and who may be appointed to either diplomatic or consular positions or assigned to serve in the Department of State subject to section 21 of this act, at the discretion of the President.

"SEC. 10. That the officers in the Foreign Service shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto, except as increases in salaries are authorized in section 33 of this act, but not exceeding in number for each class a proportion of the total number of officers in the service represented in the following percentage limitations:

"Ambassadors and ministers as now or hereafter provided: Foreign Service officers as follows: Class 1, 6 per cent, \$9,000 to \$10,000; class 2, 7 per cent, \$8,000 to \$8,900; class 3, 8 per cent, \$7,000 to \$7,900; class 4, 9 per cent, \$6,000 to \$6,900; class 5, 10 per cent, \$5,000 to \$5,900; class 6, 14 per cent, \$4,500 to \$4,900; class 7, \$4,000 to \$4,400; class 8, \$3,500 to \$3,900; unclassified, \$2,500 to \$3,400: *Provided*, That as many Foreign Service officers above class 6 as may be required for the purpose of inspection may be detailed by the Secretary of State for that purpose.

"SEC. 11. That Foreign Service officers may be commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers or both: *Provided*, That all such appointments shall be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *And provided further*, That all official acts of such officers while serving under diplomatic or consular commissions in the Foreign Service shall be performed under their respective commissions as secretaries or as consular officers.

"SEC. 12. That hereafter appointments to the position of Foreign Service officer shall be made after examination and officers so appointed shall serve a suitable period of probation in an unclassified grade or, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, after five years of continuous service in an executive or quasi executive position in the Department of State, by transfer therefrom:

Provided, That no candidate shall be eligible for examination for Foreign Service officer who is not an American citizen and who shall not have been such at least 15 years: *Provided further*, That reinstatement of Foreign Service officers separated from the classified service by reason of appointment to some other position in the Government service may be made by Executive order of the President under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Except that the number of such officers reinstated shall not affect the number of the percentage of the class provided in section 10.

"All appointments of Foreign Service officers shall be by commission to a class and not by commission to a particular post, and such officers shall be assigned to posts and may be transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require: *Provided*, That the classification of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consular officers is hereby abolished without, however in any wise impairing the validity of the present commissions of secretaries and consular officers.

"SEC. 13. That section 5 of the act of February 5, 1915 (Public, No. 242), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 14. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations, the names of those Foreign Service officers who by reason of efficient service have demonstrated special capacity for promotion to the grade of minister and the names of those Foreign Service officers and clerks and officers and employees in the Department of State who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon taking the prescribed examination to have fitness for appointment to the service, and any Foreign Service officer who may hereafter be promoted to a higher class within the classification prescribed in section 10 of this act shall have the status and receive the compensation attaching to such higher class from the date stated in his commission as the effective date of his promotion to such higher class.

"That the grade of consular assistant is hereby abolished.

"SEC. 15. That sections 1697 and 1698 of the Revised Statutes are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 16. Every secretary, consul general, consul, vice consul of career, or Foreign Service officer, before he receives his commission or enters upon the duties of his office, shall give to the United States a bond, in such form as the President shall prescribe, with such sureties, who shall be permanent residents of the United States, as the Secretary of State shall approve, in a penal sum not less than the annual compensation allowed to such officer, conditioned for the true and faithful accounting for, paying over, and delivering up of all fees, moneys, goods, effects, books, records, papers, and other property which shall come to his hands or to the hands of any other person to his use as such officer under any law now or hereafter enacted, and for the true and faithful performance of all other duties now or hereafter lawfully imposed upon him as such officer: *Provided*, That the operation of no existing bond shall in any wise be impaired by the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That such bond shall cover by its stipulations all official acts of such officer, whether commissioned as diplomatic or consular officer or Foreign Service officer. The bonds herein mentioned shall be deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 17. That the provisions of section 4 of the act of April 5, 1906, relative to the powers, duties, and prerogatives of consuls general at large are hereby made applicable to the Foreign Service officers detailed for the purpose of inspection, who shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, inspect in a substantially uniform manner the work of diplomatic and consular offices.

"SEC. 18. That the provisions of sections 8 and 10 of the act of April 5, 1906, relative to official fees and the method of accounting therefor shall apply to diplomatic officers below the grade of minister and to consular officers.

"SEC. 19. That under such regulations as the President may prescribe, and within the limitations of such appropriations as may be made therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized, ambassadors, ministers, diplomatic, consular and Foreign Service officers may be granted allowances for representation; and also post allowances wherever the cost of living may be proportionately so high that in the opinion of the Secretary of State such allowances are necessary to enable such diplomatic, consular and Foreign Service officers to carry on their work efficiently: *Provided*, That all such allowances shall be accounted for to the Secretary of State in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe and the authorization and approval of such expenditures by the Secretary of State, as complying with such rules and regulations, shall be binding upon all officers of the Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall report all such expenditures annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the Department of State.

"SEC. 20. Appropriations are authorized for the salary of a private secretary to each ambassador to be appointed by the ambassador and hold office at his pleasure.

"SEC. 21. That any Foreign Service officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State without loss of class or salary, such assignment to be for a period of not more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1742 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, any ambassador or minister or any Foreign Service officer of whatever class detailed for duty in connection with trade conferences or international gatherings, congresses, or conferences, or for other special duty not at his post or in the Department of State, except temporarily for purposes of consultation, shall be paid his salary and expenses for travel and subsistence at the rates prescribed by law.

"SEC. 22. That the Secretary of State is authorized, whenever he deems it to be in the public interest, to order to the United States on his statutory leave of absence any Foreign Service officer or vice consul of career who has performed three years or more of continuous service abroad: *Provided*, That the expenses of transportation and subsistence of such officers and their immediate families, in traveling from their posts to their homes in the United States and return, shall be paid under the same rules and regulations applicable in the case of officers going to and returning from their posts under orders of the Secretary of State when not on leave: *And provided further*, That while in the United States the services of such officers shall be available for trade conference work or for such duties in the Department of State as the Secretary of State may prescribe, but the time of such work or duties shall not be counted as leave.

"The Secretary of State is authorized, in his discretion and subject to such regulations as may be issued by the President to grant to any officer or employee of the Foreign Service not to exceed 60 days annual leave of absence with pay. If such officer or employee returns to the United States, the leave of absence granted under the provisions of this section shall be exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the United States, and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting sailing. Any portion of 60 days annual leave not granted or availed of in any one year may be cumulative, not to exceed, exclusive of time in transit and awaiting sailing, 120 days in three years or 180 days in four years: *Provided further*, That employees, not American citizens, may be granted not to exceed 30 days leave of absence with pay in any one year.

"The Secretary of State is also authorized to grant to any officer or employee of the Foreign Service on account of personal illness or on account of exposure to a contagious disease which would render presence at a post of duty hazardous to the health of fellow employees, sick leave of absence with pay at the rate of 15 days a year, the unused portion of such sick leave to be cumulative not to exceed 120 days: *Provided*, That during the first year of operation of this act not to exceed 30 days of additional sick leave of absence with pay may be granted.

"No Foreign Service officer shall be absent from his post with pay for more than 48 hours without permission, except as provided herein.

"Section 1742 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 23. That the part of the act of July 1, 1916 (Public, Numbered 131), which authorizes the President to designate and assign any secretary of class 1 as counselor of Embassy or Legation, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That the President may, whenever he considers it advisable so to do, designate and assign any Foreign Service officer as counselor of embassy or legation."

"Sec. 24. That within the discretion of the President, any Foreign Service officer may be assigned to act as commissioner, chargé d'affaires, minister resident, or diplomatic agent for such period as the public interests may require without loss of grade, class, or salary: *Provided, however*, That no such officer shall receive more than one salary.

"Sec. 25. That for such times as any Foreign Service officer shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim or to assume charge of a consulate general or consulate during the absence of the principal officer at the post to which he shall have been assigned, he shall, if his salary is less than one-half that of such principal officer, receive in addition to his salary as Foreign Service officer, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and one-half of the salary provided by law for the ambassador, minister, or principal consular officer, as the case may be.

"Sec. 26. The President is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a Foreign Service retirement and disability system to be administered under the direction of the Secretary of State and in accordance with the following principles, to wit:

"(a) The Secretary of State shall submit annually a comparative report showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities, together with the total number of persons receiving annuities and the amounts paid them, and shall submit annually estimates of appropriations necessary to continue this section in full force and such appropriations are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That in no event shall the aggregate total appropriations exceed the aggregate total of the contributions of the Foreign Service officers theretofore made, and accumulated interest thereon.

"(b) There is hereby created a special fund to be known as the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.

"(c) Five per cent of the basic salary of all Foreign Service officers eligible to retirement shall be contributed to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed on the date on which this act takes effect to cause such deductions to be made and the sums transferred on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances: *Provided*, That all basic salaries in excess of \$10,000 per annum shall be treated as \$10,000.

"(d) When any Foreign Service officer has reached the age of 65 years and rendered at least 15 years of service he shall be retired: *Provided*, That if any such officer shall have served 30 years he may be retired at his own request before reaching the age of 65 years: *Provided further*, That the President may in his discretion retain any such officer on active duty for such period prior to his reaching 70 years of age, as he may deem for the interests of the United States.

"(e) Annuities shall be paid to retired Foreign Service officers under the following classification, based upon length of service and at the following percentages of the average annual basic salary for the 10 years next preceding the date of retirement: Class A, 30 years or more, 60 per cent; class B, from 27 to 30 years, 54 per cent; class C, from 24 to 27 years, 48 per cent; class D, from 21 to 24 years, 42 per cent; class E, from 18 to 21 years, 36 per cent; class F, from 15 to 18 years, 30 per cent: *Provided, however*, That in computing the average annual basic salary for the 10 years next preceding the date of retirement, so much of an officer's service as

was rendered prior to July 1, 1924, in accordance with the classification and salaries established by laws then in effect, as it is possible to credit to him by applying to all such periods of service rendered prior to July 1, 1924, the rules for corresponding classes in the reclassification provisions in section 7 of the act of May 24, 1924, shall be considered as having been performed in accordance with the classifications and salaries established for Foreign Service officers in section 3 of the act of May 24, 1924; *And provided further*, That no increases in annuities under this act shall operate retroactively and nothing in this act shall be interpreted as reducing the rate of the annuity received by any retired officer on the effective date of this act.

"(f) Those officers who retire before having contributed for each year of service shall have withheld from their annuities to the credit of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund such proportion of 5 per cent as the number of years in which they did not contribute bears to the total length of service: *Provided*, That no deductions shall be made from the annuities of officers who have contributed 30 years, and no officer shall be required to contribute more than 30 years in any circumstances.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to invest from time to time in interest-bearing securities of the United States such portions of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund.

"(h) None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(i) In case an annuitant dies without having received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount of his contributions from salary with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum compounded annually up to the time of his death, the excess of said accumulated contributions over the said annuity payments shall be paid to his or her legal representatives; and in case a Foreign Service officer shall die without having reached the retirement age the total amount of his contribution with accrued interest shall be paid to his legal representatives.

"(j) That any Foreign Service officer who, before reaching the age of retirement, becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the President, be retired on an annuity under paragraph (e) of this section: *Provided, however*, That in each case such disability shall be determined by the report of a duly qualified physician or surgeon designated by the Secretary of State to conduct the examination: *Provided further*, That unless the disability be permanent, a like examination shall be made annually in order to determine the degree of disability, and the payment of annuity shall cease from the date of the medical examination showing recovery.

"Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.

"When the annuity is discontinued under this provision before the annuitant has received a sum equal to the total amount of his contributions, with accrued interest, the difference shall be paid to him or to his legal representatives.

"(k) The President is authorized from time to time to establish, by Executive order, a list of places which by reason of climatic or other extreme conditions are to be classed as unhealthful posts, and each year of duty subsequent to January 1, 1900, at such posts, inclusive of regular leaves of absence, of officers already retired or hereafter retired, shall be counted as one year and a half, and so on in like proportion in reckoning the length of service for the purpose of retirement, fractional months being considered as full months in computing such service: *Provided, however*, That the President may at any time cancel the designation

of any places as unhealthful without affecting any credit which has accrued for service at such posts prior to the date of the cancellation.

"(l) Whenever a Foreign Service officer becomes separated from the service except for disability before reaching the age of retirement, or under section 33 of this act, the total amount of contribution from his salary with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum compounded annually up to the date of such separation, shall be returned to him.

"(m) The Secretary of State is authorized to expend from surplus money to the credit of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund an amount not exceeding \$5,000 per annum for the expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section, including actuarial advice.

"(n) Any diplomatic secretary or consular officer who has been or any Foreign Service officer who may hereafter be promoted from the classified service to the grade of ambassador or minister, or appointed to a position in the Department of State, shall be entitled to all the benefits of this section in the same manner and under the same conditions as Foreign Service officers: *Provided*, That any officer now included under the act of May 24, 1924, and the amendment thereto of July 3, 1926, shall be entitled to the benefits of this section.

"(o) For the purposes of this act the period of service shall be computed from the date of original oath of office as diplomatic secretary, consul general, consul, vice consul, deputy consul, consular assistant, consular agent, commercial agent, interpreter, or student interpreter, and shall include periods of service at different times as either a diplomatic or consular officer, or while on assignment to the Department of State, or on special duty or service in another department or establishment of the Government, but all periods of separation from the service and so much of any period of leave of absence without pay as may exceed six months shall be excluded: *Provided*, That service in the Department of State or as clerk in a mission or consulate prior to appointment as a Foreign Service officer may be included in the period of service, in which case the officer shall pay into the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund a special contribution equal to 5 per cent of his annual salary for each year of such employment, with interest thereon to date of payment compounded annually at 4 per cent, provided that such special contribution shall be subject to the limitations established by subdivision (f) of this section.

"SEC. 27. In the event of public emergency any retired Foreign Service officer may be recalled temporarily to active service by the President, and while so serving he shall be entitled in lieu of his retirement allowance to the full pay of the class in which he is temporarily serving.

"SEC. 28. That all provisions of law heretofore enacted relating to diplomatic secretaries and to consular officers, which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby made applicable to Foreign Service officers when they are designated for service as diplomatic or consular officers, and that all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 29. That the appropriations contained in Title I of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes,' for such compensation and expenses as are affected by the provisions of this act are made available and may be applied toward the payment of the compensation and expenses herein provided.

"SEC. 30. That there is hereby established in the Department of State the office of legal adviser (in lieu of the Solicitor of the Department of State, which office is hereby abolished). The legal adviser shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive the same salary as Assistant Secretaries of State.

"SEC. 31. There shall be in the Department of State a board of Foreign Service personnel for the Foreign Service,

whose duty it shall be to recommend promotions in the Foreign Service and to furnish the Secretary of State with lists of Foreign Service officers who have demonstrated special capacity for promotion to the grade of minister. The board shall be composed of not more than three Assistant Secretaries of State, one of whom shall be the Assistant Secretary of State having supervision over the division of Foreign Service personnel, who shall be chairman. The chief of the division of Foreign Service personnel and one other member of the division may attend the meetings of the board and one of them shall act as secretary, but they shall not be entitled to vote in its proceedings. No Foreign Service officer below class I shall be assigned for duty in the division of Foreign Service personnel. Foreign Service officers assigned to the division shall not be eligible for recommendation by the board of Foreign Service personnel for promotion to the grade of minister or ambassador during the period of such assignment or for three years thereafter, nor shall such officers be given any authority except of a purely advisory character, over promotions, demotions, transfers, or separations from the service of Foreign Service officers.

"SEC. 32. The division of Foreign Service personnel shall assemble, record, and be the custodian of all available information in regard to the character, ability, conduct, quality of work, industry, experience, dependability and general availability of Foreign Service officers, including reports of inspecting officers and efficiency reports of supervising officers. All such information shall be appraised at least once in two years and the result of such appraisal expressed in terms of excellent, very good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory, accompanied by a concise statement of the considerations upon which they are based, shall be entered upon records to be known as the efficiency records of the officers, and shall constitute their efficiency ratings for the period. No charges against an officer that would adversely affect his efficiency rating or his value to the service, if true, shall be taken into consideration in determining his efficiency rating except after the officer shall have had opportunity to reply thereto. The Assistant Secretary of State supervising the division of Foreign Service personnel shall be responsible for the keeping of accurate and impartial efficiency records of Foreign Service officers and shall take all measures necessary to insure their accuracy and impartiality. Not later than November 1 at least every two years, the division of Foreign Service personnel shall, under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of State, prepare a list in which all Foreign Service officers shall be graded in accordance with their relative efficiency and value to the service. In this list officers shall be graded as excellent, very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory with such further subclassification as may be found necessary. All officers rated satisfactory or above shall be eligible for promotion in the order of merit to the minimum salary of the next higher class. This list shall not become effective in so far as it affects promotion until it has been considered by the board of Foreign Service personnel hereinbefore provided for and approved by the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That this list shall not be changed before the next succeeding list of ratings is approved except in case of extraordinary or conspicuously meritorious service or serious misconduct and any change for such reasons shall be made only after consideration by the Board of Foreign Service Personnel and approval by the Secretary of State, and the reasons for such change when made shall be inscribed upon the efficiency records of the officers affected. From this list of all Foreign Service officers recommendations for promotion shall be made in the order of their ascertained merit within classes. Recommendations shall also be made, in order of merit, as shown by ratings in the examinations for appointment to the unclassified grade, with commissions also as diplomatic secretaries and vice consuls, of those who have successfully passed the examinations. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration and if he shall approve, for transmission to the President.

"The correspondence and records of the division of Foreign Service personnel shall be confidential except to the

President, the Secretary of State, the members of the Board of Foreign Service personnel, the Assistant Secretary of State supervising the division, and such of its employees as may be assigned to work on such correspondence and records.

"Sec. 33. That notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 of this act, all Foreign Service officers having a rating of satisfactory or better, who shall have been in classes 5, 6, 7, or 8 for a continuous period of nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year receive an increase of salary of \$100, except that no officer shall receive a salary above the maximum of his class and all such officers in classes 1, 2, 3, or 4 shall in the same circumstances receive an increase of \$200: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to fix the salaries of Foreign Service officers in the unclassified grade within the salary range specified in section 10 of this act; and, within the limits of appropriations therefor, to grant to Foreign Service officers in any class additional promotion in salary within the salary range established for the classes in which they are serving, based upon especially meritorious service. Increases in salary under the terms of this section shall be paid to Foreign Service officers only as the right to such increases accrues after the effective date of this act. The President is hereby authorized to establish by Executive order regulations providing for the separation of Foreign Service officers from the Foreign Service, in accordance with the conditions hereinafter prescribed. Foreign Service officers so separated from the Foreign Service shall be retired from the service, after a hearing by the Secretary of State, upon an annuity equal to 25 per cent of his salary at the time of retirement, in the case of officers over 45 years of age or in the case of officers under 45 years of age with a bonus of one year's salary at the time of his retirement, either annuity or one year's salary to be payable out of the Foreign Service officers' retirement and disability fund and except as herein provided, subject to the same provisions and limitations as other annuities payable out of such funds; but no return of contributions shall be made under paragraphs (i) or (l) of section 26 of this act in the case of any Foreign Service officer retired under the provisions of this section. Whenever it is determined that the efficiency rating of an officer is unsatisfactory, thereby meaning below the standard required for the service, and such determination has been confirmed by the Secretary of State, the officer shall be notified thereof, and if, after a reasonable period to be determined by the circumstances in each particular case, the rating of such officer continues to be found unsatisfactory and such finding is confirmed by the Secretary of State after a hearing accorded the officer, such officer shall be separated from the service with the annuity or bonus provided in this section, but no officer so separated from the service shall receive the said annuity or bonus unless at the time of separation he shall have served at least 15 years. He shall, however, if he has not served at least 15 years have returned to him the full sum of his contribution to the annuity fund, with interest thereon at 4 per cent compounded annually. The benefits of this section, except at the option of the Secretary of State the return of an officer's contribution to the annuity fund, shall not be given to Foreign Service officers separated from the Foreign Service on account of malfeasance in office.

"Sec. 34. That nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce the salary of any Foreign Service officer upon promotion to a higher class.

"Sec. 35. That the President is hereby authorized, whenever the necessity for such offices with a view to effecting economies in accounting procedure is apparent, to prescribe certain fiscal districts or areas and to establish within each such district as a part of the Department of State service, a district accounting and disbursing office to exercise control over the accounts and returns of all diplomatic missions and consular offices within the district in such manner as the President may direct. To each such office may be assigned the administrative accounting responsibility for receipts and expenditures of the diplomatic missions and

consular offices within the district. Each district office shall be in charge of an accountable officer, to whom all fees, and other official moneys, received by any diplomatic, consular or Foreign Service officer may be accounted for, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State, all such fees and moneys, or the residue thereof after the payment of salaries, allowances, and current expenses of the diplomatic missions and consular offices within the district, to be paid by the district accounting and disbursing officer into the Treasury of the United States. Such district accounting and disbursing officers accountable for public moneys may intrust moneys to other bonded officers for the purpose of having them make disbursements as his agent, and the officer to whom the moneys are intrusted, as well as the officer who intrusts the moneys to him, shall be held pecuniarily responsible therefor to the United States. All diplomatic, consular, or Foreign Service officers on duty within the area covered by such district offices may be required to render accounts of their disbursements to the officer in charge of such district office to be included in his accounts. Said district accounting and disbursing officers and their agents shall be bonded respectively to the United States for the faithful performance of their duties in such penal amounts as the President may require.

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to appoint such district accounting and disbursing officers and their assistants in the same manner as clerks in diplomatic missions and consular offices are appointed.

"Section 3622 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 496), and any other existing statutes, in so far as they conflict with this section, are hereby amended.

"Sec. 36. That all fees and other official moneys received by diplomatic missions or consular offices or by the district accounting and disbursing offices provided in section 35 above, may be transmitted through the Department of State for deposit in the United States Treasury, or may be used in payment of salaries, allowances, and current expenses of said missions and offices, under such rules and regulations as the President may from time to time prescribe; the residue, if any, to be transmitted through the Department of State for deposit in the United States Treasury. Section 3617 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 484) is hereby amended.

"Sec. 37. That this act shall take effect on July 1, 1931." And the Senate agree to the same.

H. W. TEMPLE,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
J. CHAS. LINTHICUM,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEO. H. MOSES,
DAVID A. REED,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment added to the House bill, in amended form, the act (Public, No. 135, 68th Cong.) approved May 24, 1924. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agrees to it with an amendment which is substituted for the Senate amendment. The essential differences between the House bill and the bill recommended by the conferees are:

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, provide for the classification of clerks in the Foreign Service. These sections are in precisely the form in which they were passed by both the House and Senate.

Sections 7 to 37, inclusive, comprise the amendment agreed to by the conferees as a substitute for the Senate

amendment disagreed to by the House. The provisions of these sections have been subjected to most intensive study by interested Members of the Senate and the House, officials of the State Department, and members of the Foreign Service. As included in the conference report these sections have the unqualified approval of all.

They contemplate the reenactment of the present Foreign Service law (the act of May 24, 1924), with changes designed to eliminate defects which have been discovered during the six and one-half years of practical experience with the act, and effecting other improvements not inconsistent with the original purposes of that act. The following comments refer only to the sections of the bill approved in conference which effect material changes in the present law and the absence of such comment as to all other sections indicates that no important change is made in existing law.

Section 10 reenacts the classification and salary provisions of the present law, except as follows:

Instead of prescribing a fixed salary for each class (as at present) the new section creates minimum and maximum salaries within which promotions in salary may be made, without promotion in class. The present salaries paid to Foreign Service officers are in each instance the minimum salary for each class, and the maximum is always below the minimum salary for the next higher class. The manner in which these increases in salary within classes are granted is explained in the comment regarding section 33, which establishes the procedure.

The desirability of a salary range for each class in any classified Government service, rather than a fixed rate to be paid over an indefinite period, or until a promotion in class can be achieved, is well recognized. This principle is already in effect throughout the classified civil service of this Government, and the same result is attained in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service by means of length of service increases in the salaries provided by law. Even more recently, in enacting the law of March 3, 1927, which created the Foreign Commerce Service, a salary range was established for each class of foreign commerce officers, and the act vests in the Secretary of Commerce the full authority to regulate salaries within the limits established and the appropriations made available for the purpose. The creation of the salary range for class 1 of the Foreign Service, which is analogous to the salary range in the highest class of other branches of Government service, including the highest class of Foreign Commerce officers (with the same maximum salary authorized by law for such officers), is a particularly desirable improvement.

This change in the salary classification can be so administered as not to call for increased appropriations, which is further explained in the comment on section 33.

Section 12 of the bill, as approved in conference, regulates new appointments in the Foreign Service and differs from section 5 of the act of May 24, 1924 (to which it corresponds), in the following particulars:

1. A new requirement is made that candidates for admission to the service shall be citizens of the United States for at least 15 years.

2. It is definitely provided that officers who have left the service to accept other Government positions can be reinstated only within the percentage limitations of classes fixed in section 10. This rule has always been observed, even under the present law.

Section 19 authorizes the President, in his discretion and within such appropriations as the Congress may make, to grant also to consular offices representation allowances restricted by the act of May 24, 1924, to diplomatic missions and a few consular offices at capitals where there are no diplomatic missions. It is well known to the Congress that consular offices at certain important points other than the capitals have as heavy representation responsibilities as diplomatic missions at some capitals, and it is the opinion of the conferees that suitable provision should be made for them.

This section, in accordance with the present policy of Congress to enact general legislation authorizing all regular

annual appropriations, also gives statutory authorization to post-allowance appropriations which the Congress has been making annually for many years for the Foreign Service.

Section 22 of the bill, as approved by the conferees, incorporates the law governing leaves of absence for Foreign Service officers and employees into the Foreign Service act, instead of having a separate statute as at present. This section authorizes the same leave of absence permitted under the present law; that is, not exceeding 60 days annually, subject to regulations established by the President to limit in the interest of the service the leaves of absence granted within this maximum. It contains the following new provisions, also subject to limitation by presidential regulations:

1. Leave of absence to visit the United States, when not taken as available, may be accumulated up to not exceeding 180 days in four years;

2. Fifteen days per annum of sick leave (cumulative up to 120 days) may be granted to officers and employees who become ill in the performance of their duties in foreign countries.

Section 26 of the bill recommended in the conference report corresponds to section 18 of the act of May 24, 1924, which includes all provisions of law relating to the retirement of Foreign Service officers upon annuities. This section would effect no material change in the present retirement system and the minor improvements hereinafter enumerated in no way affect the present basis of contributions of officers and appropriations. The improvements provided are (a) authorization for voluntary retirement after 30 years of service; (b) limitation of an officer's contributions to a period of 30 years, which is the basis for the maximum annuity; (c) the provision for extra credit toward retirement for service at unhealthful posts is made retroactive to January 1, 1900; (d) elimination of the present provision of law which requires a 25 per cent forfeiture of an officer's contributions to the retirement fund if he resigns from the service; and (e) elimination of present provisions of law which prevent retired officers from obtaining employment with salaries in excess of their annuities, which is a particular hardship upon retired officers with low annuities.

Section 26 also provides a moderate increase in the annuities to be paid after the passage of the act to those officers who retired on July 1, 1924, and those who have retired or will retire between that date and July 1, 1934, by having their annuities computed on the basis of a full 10-year period of service under the salary scale established by the act of May 24, 1924, instead of partly under that salary scale and partly under the salary scale existing before the act became effective. The annuities to be paid to the officers affected, after the passage of this act, credits them for service rendered prior to July 1, 1924 (and within the 10-year period on which their annuities are based), at the rates for salaries established in the act of May 24, 1924. Owing to the limited number of officers who can be benefited and the fact that all officers who retire after July 1, 1934, are not affected, this provision is entirely consistent with the sound financial policy of the retirement system.

Section 30: Provides for the creation in the Department of State of the office of legal adviser, who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive the same salary as Assistant Secretaries of State. Owing to the special and unique character of the duties of the chief law officer of the Department of State, the office of solicitor is abolished and the legal adviser is made exclusively an officer of the State Department in the same manner as the chief law officers of all departments except State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor.

Sections 31 and 32: Establish and define the duties of a division of Foreign Service personnel and a board of Foreign Service personnel to assist the President and the Secretary of State in administering the Foreign Service. These sections have the approval of the Secretary of State and assure the continuance of policies with respect to personnel administration which have been tested and found by experience to be equitable and desirable without, however, placing any

burdensome restraint upon the executive authority of the President and the Secretary of State over the Foreign Service.

Section 33, as approved by the conferees, effects two important improvements in the Foreign Service, as follows:

1. Within the salary limits established by section 10 of the bill, officers having a satisfactory rating on July 1, of each year receive a promotion in salary of \$100 per annum in classes 5, 6, 7, and 8, and \$200 per annum in classes 1, 2, 3, and 4; provided that they have been in their present class at least nine months of the preceding year.

The enactment of this provision enabling small annual increases in salary without promotions in class is expected to relieve in large measure the pressure for promotions in class. This result enables the conforming of the program for promotions in class to meet budgetary requirements and makes it feasible to defer the filling of vacancies in the service with the object of obviating a necessity for increased appropriations, notwithstanding the granting of annual increases to officers rendering satisfactory service.

This provision is so drafted that no annual increases in salary can accrue during the present fiscal year or during the next fiscal year. Thereafter, no material increase, if any, will be necessary in the appropriation for salaries of Foreign Service officers as increases in salary within the salary ranges provided in the bill can be set off against savings effected by deferring the filling of vacancies; and also it will be possible to utilize unexpended balances which have occurred in these appropriations because of the absence in the past of any authorization in the Department of State to make any promotions of a strictly administrative character.

2. This section contains a much-needed provision establishing an equitable method for the involuntary retirement of unsatisfactory officers upon an appropriate annuity, or a bonus of one year's salary (depending upon the officer's age at retirement). Adequate provision is made for previous warning concerning unsatisfactory work and for granting a hearing to officers before such involuntary separations.

Section 35 authorizes the President to establish districts in foreign countries in which the accounting and disbursing activities of the Foreign Service can be consolidated under the control of a single disbursing officer for each district. This authorization will not call for additional appropriations, but, on the contrary, will make possible important economies in administration. It is the result of much study on the part of the Departments of State and Treasury and of the General Accounting Office, and has the approval of these three branches of the Government. The consolidation of the accounting and disbursing work as proposed can not be put into effect without an enabling statute such as is recommended.

H. W. TEMPLE,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
J. CHAS. LINTHICUM,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extensive change in the legislative policy so far as the clerical force of our Foreign Service is concerned, I think it would be met if the chairman of the committee would make some explanation of the suggested substitute agreed upon.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, is there any particular explanation the gentleman desires made?

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a complete change of existing law, and I noticed in the reading of the statement that it is prescribed that only American citizens who have been citizens 10 years—

Mr. TEMPLE. Fifteen years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Fifteen years citizens of the country are eligible for clerkships.

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, no; eligible for a commission as a Foreign Service officer.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think it would be informing to the House if the gentleman

would make some general statement of the proposed changes.

Mr. TEMPLE. I shall be very glad to do so.

The bill was sent to conference shortly before the adjournment of the Congress last June. The House conferees were not willing to accept the Senate amendment in the form in which it was passed, and there was a great deal of work upon it. There was no difference of opinion at all between the Senate and the House as to the text of the bill that passed the House. A Senate amendment was added which did not modify anything in that bill, but which revised, although not with very radical changes, the existing law with regard to Foreign Service officers. The changes that were found by experience to be desirable have been incorporated in the Senate amendment, as accepted by the conferees and now reported for the consideration of the House.

The Senate amendment looks rather formidable, but it is practically a reenactment of existing law with changes which are pointed out in the statement that was read in lieu of the report. One of them the gentleman from Wisconsin has called attention to. It provides that no one shall be commissioned as a Foreign Service officer who has not been for 15 years an American citizen. This does not affect the clerks, for local men, not American citizens may be needed in consular offices because of their acquaintance with local language and local business, but it applies to the consular and diplomatic officers who are regularly commissioned as officers in the Foreign Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the difference in the promotion scheme proposed in the conference report as far as the clerical force is concerned?

Mr. TEMPLE. That has already passed both Houses and is not at all in dispute.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression there is a different method of promotion for the clerical force, as embodied in the conference report.

Mr. TEMPLE. For the Foreign Service officers but not for the clerks. There is no difference between the House and the Senate as to the clerical force, and if I should review that part of the bill I would find my memory somewhat at fault, because it has been several months since I considered that phase of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the Foreign Service officers under the Senate amendment, will the gentleman explain the difference in the proposed law as to promotions?

Mr. TEMPLE. At the present time the increases in salary from one class to another amount in the lower classes to \$500 a year and in the upper classes to \$1,000 a year. There is no difference in the salaries of officers of the same class. The amendment provides that in lieu of the jump of \$1,000, when the men pass from one class to another, there may be in the lower grades an increase of \$100 a year within the maximum of the salaries for that class, and in the upper grades an increase of \$200 per year. It is expected that this will make no material difference in the cost. It is certain it will make no difference whatever in the cost for at least this year and next year, and it is not difficult to see that if a man goes up at a step of \$100 or \$200, rather than a step of \$1,000 or \$500, it will give a stimulus to his ambition within the class, and will not delay the reward until he is ready for the \$1,000 step by promotion to another class.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the practice heretofore, promotions have been contingent upon the appropriations.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And now it is intended to make them mandatory, but to make the promotions a certain stated amount each year, namely, \$100 in the lower grades and \$200 in the upper grades.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not mandatory, but to be given to the men who reach a certain degree of efficiency in their work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; I meant mandatory upon his record being satisfactory.

Mr. TEMPLE. This enables the State Department in its administration of the department to give rewards to men who are doing efficient work, but it does not require them to advance anybody automatically; and the rewards in the lower grades, as I say, are \$100 a year, and in the upper grades \$200 a year, so that a man need not feel, when he reaches a certain grade, that now he is done until he is ready for another long step. I think it will be a stimulus to ambition and efficient work.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 71, 72, and 73.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 37 and 67, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of reconstructing and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of such reconstructing and paving of that portion of the said street which so abuts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$863,370"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,658,342"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,730,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,052,777,010"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 38, 53, 69, and 70.

EDWARD H. WASON,

JOHN W. SUMMERS,

C. A. WOODRUM,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY W. KEYES,

REED SMOOT,

W. L. JONES,

CARTER GLASS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The following amendments, with respect to which the accompanying conference report recommends that the Senate shall recede, deal exclusively with underaverage salary increases: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, and 73.

On No. 3, pertaining to the Arlington Memorial Bridge appropriation and the share of the Federal Treasury in the cost of reconstructing and paving of B Street NW. under the approved project: Proposes perfected language, in lieu of that adopted by the House and in lieu of that proposed by the Senate, so as to provide:

"That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of reconstructing and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of such reconstructing and paving of that portion of the said street which so abuts."

On Nos. 13 and 17 (Civil Service Commission): Eliminates the Senate proposal of \$9,060 for underaverage salary increases; provides \$13,800, as proposed by the Senate, for three additional positions in the Washington office at \$4,600 each per annum, to constitute an appeal board; and corrects the total.

On No. 22: Corrects a total.

On No. 37: Strikes out the House language, "fiscal year 1931," in correction of a clerical error.

On No. 67: Inserts the word "appropriation," as proposed by the Senate, in the citation of an act, so as to make it read "Independent offices appropriation act."

On No. 68: Strikes out the Senate proposal that "No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation shall be available for the maintenance of a sea service bureau."

On No. 72: Strikes out the Senate provision amending the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928, providing that no person shall on and after July 1, 1931, be entitled to and/or paid retired pay under said act, for any period during which he is receiving a salary, pay, and/or compensation from the United States which exceeds \$2,000 per annum.

On No. 74: Corrects the total of the bill.

IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference have not agreed with respect to the following amendments:

On No. 38: Pertaining to the Housing Corporation. The Senate amendment strikes out the entire House provision relating to this establishment and proposes no language in lieu of the provision stricken out.

On No. 53: Pertaining to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Senate amendment, with reference to the employment of real-estate and other technical services, provides that same may be employed "without reference to civil service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended."

On No. 69: Pertaining to purchases by the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation of articles of foreign growth or foreign production or manufacture.

On No. 70: Increasing the authority of the United States Shipping Board to enter into contracts to make loans from the construction loan fund, from \$150,000,000 to \$185,000,000.

EDWARD H. WASON,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
C. A. WOODRUM,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read amendment 38, which strikes out, on page 25, beginning at line 10, all of the text to and including line 5 on page 27.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following:

"HOUSING CORPORATION"

"Salaries and expenses: For officers, clerks, and other employees, and for contingent and miscellaneous expenses, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including blank books, maps, stationery, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, freight and express charges, communication service, travel expense, printing and binding not to exceed \$150, and all other miscellaneous items and expenses not included in the foregoing and necessary to collect and account for the receipts from the sale of properties and the receipts from the operation of unsold properties of the United States Housing Corporation, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, property commandeered by the United States through the Secretary of Labor, and to collect the amounts advanced to transportation facilities and others; for payment of special assessments and other utility, municipal, State, and county charges or assessments unpaid by purchasers, and which have been assessed against property in which the United States Housing Corporation has an interest, and to defray expenses incident to foreclosing mortgages, conducting sales under deeds of trust, or reacquiring title or possession of real property under default proceeding, including attorney fees, witness fees, court costs, charges, and other miscellaneous expenses; for the maintenance and repair of houses, buildings, and improvements which are unsold; in all, \$15,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$4,900 per annum, and only one person may be employed at that rate: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein: *Provided further*, That the directors of the United States Housing Corporation of New York and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania may, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, appoint the chief clerk or other officer of the Department of Labor to act, as their president or as their immediate representative in charge of administrative work, such departmental officer to serve without compensation in addition to the salary of his official position, and the directors of these corporations may in like manner designate the disbursing clerk for the Department of Labor to act in a similar capacity for the corporations, and after such designation has been made all funds coming into the hands of said disbursing clerk shall be treated as funds of the United States to be accounted for under his official bond."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 53: On page 34, line 4, after the word "services," insert "and without reference to civil-service rules and the classification act of 1923 as amended."

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 69: Page 49, after line 2, strike out the paragraph and insert the following:

"That in the expenditure of appropriations in this act for the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, the said corporation shall, when in its discretion the interest of the Government will permit, purchase for use, or contract for the use, within the limits of the United States only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding any existing laws to the contrary."

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That in the expenditure of appropriations in this act the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation shall, unless in its discretion the interest of the Government will not permit, purchase for use, or contract for the use of, within the limits of the United States only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding that such articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States may cost more if such excess of cost be not unreasonable."

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASON. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. AYRES as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. WASON.

Amendment by Mr. AYRES: I propose the following substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON]: In lieu of the matter inserted by Senate amendment No. 69, insert the following:

"No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation shall be available during the fiscal year 1932 for the purchase of any kind of fuel oil of foreign production for issue, delivery, or sale to ships at points either in the United States or its possessions, where oil of the production of the United States or its possessions is available."

"That in the expenditure of appropriations in this act the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation shall, except as provided in the preceding paragraph, unless in its discretion the interest of the Government will not permit, purchase for use, or contract for the use of, within the limits of the United States only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding that such articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States may cost more if such excess of cost be not unreasonable."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 70: Page 50, beginning in line 1, insert "The authority granted to the United States Shipping Board by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, to enter into contracts to make loans from the construction loan fund is hereby increased from \$150,000,000 to \$185,000,000."

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

JUDGE HARRY B. ANDERSON

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I present the following report from the Committee on the Judiciary in the case of charges against Harry B. Anderson, United States district judge, together with a resolution, and I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Report No. 2714, House of Representatives, Seventy-first Congress, third session]

CHARGES AGAINST HON. HARRY B. ANDERSON, UNITED STATES JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

Under authority of House Resolution 191, Seventy-first Congress, a special committee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives was appointed from the membership to inquire into the official conduct of Harry B. Anderson, United States district judge for the western district of Tennessee. The special committee authorized under this resolution consisted of Hon. ANDREW J. HICKEY, chairman; Hon. FIORELLO H. LA GUARDIA, Hon. CHARLES I. SPARKS, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, and Hon. GORDON BROWNING, who gave months of careful and searching inquiry and examination into the charges preferred against Judge Harry B. Anderson.

The committee has reported that there are no grounds for invoking the high power of impeachment and the exercise of it on the part of the House. The investigation discloses certain matters which the committee does not desire to be regarded as in any way approving or sanctioning. The practice existing in the western district of Tennessee, both under Judge Anderson and his predecessors, of appointing referees to the place and position of receivers in bankruptcy matters is one which the committee thinks ought to be discontinued and desires to express its disapproval of the practice. The atmosphere and surroundings in the Tully case while free from evidence of wrong on the part of the judge, lead the committee to say that in their opinion when private matters or family matters come in touch with the court a judge should exercise more than ordinary care to avoid the appearance of improperly using the process of the court in any way that might be misunderstood, for in such matters the conduct of a judge must always be above suspicion.

The following resolution is submitted to the House with the recommendation that it be adopted:

House Resolution 362

Resolved, That the evidence submitted on the charges against Hon. Harry B. Anderson, district judge for the western district of Tennessee, does not warrant the interposition of the constitutional powers of impeachment of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 17163, the second deficiency appropriation bill; and pending that, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether we can agree on time for general debate?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I have a good many requests, but I think that we can get through with an hour and a half on a side, although that will not take care of everyone.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Tennessee and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Tennessee and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 17163, the second deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when the adjusted service certificate bill, providing for increased loans at 4½ per cent, was under consideration I was yielded one minute, in which time I stated that I thought the adjusted service bill as presented to the House was the safest, the soundest, and the sanest piece of veterans' legislation that we had considered for the past 10 years. I would like to amend that statement by saying that in my opinion it is the safest, the soundest, and the sanest from the point of view of the Treasury Department. Ever since we passed that bill the big metropolitan newspapers have been attacking the House of Representatives, editorially, claiming that it was a raid upon the Treasury that would disrupt the

business of the country, and that it would require new and heavy taxes.

I hold in my hand a number of editorials from metropolitan newspapers. There is one from the Washington Post, of this city, dated February 17, headed "Heavy Taxes in Sight." All through this editorial there is the charge that this piece of legislation would require new and heavy taxes in order to finance it. Other newspapers talk about the loans provided for in this legislation as being a bonus to the veterans. A bonus means a gift, and these loans are not a gift at all, because the veterans would have to pay 4½ per cent interest on every loan they made, whether small or large, and the Treasury of the United States could refinance or refund the securities held in the Treasury to redeem these certificates at 3 per cent to pay for the loans made by the veterans at 4½ per cent, thereby making a profit on every loan, whether large or small, of 1½ per cent.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I understand that in the sinking fund created to pay this adjusted compensation in 1945 there is now approximately \$700,000,000.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is approximately correct. There is \$750,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And this money, as I understand it, is being loaned by the Treasury Department.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Can the gentleman inform us at what rate of interest it is now being loaned?

Mr. FISH. I do not know the rate of interest, but it certainly could be refinanced or refunded at 3 per cent, or in short-term notes at 2 per cent or less than 2 per cent; but on long-term notes or bond issues it can be refunded certainly at 3 per cent. It is on those facts that I base the statement that the Treasury, instead of increasing taxes, will gain 1½ points on every loan that is made to veterans under the provisions of the bill we passed a few days ago. I do not consider that exactly a bonus or gift to the veteran.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I agree entirely with the gentleman—

Mr. FISH. I am sorry, but I wish I had time to yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am not arguing with the gentleman from New York. I approve of the gentleman's position. The Treasury Department now has \$750,000,000 that is being loaned to somebody somewhere in the United States.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and it is drawing interest.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It is drawing interest, and I have been given to understand that the rate of interest on that money loaned to somebody other than the man whose money it is is lower than the rate of interest that the soldiers are in the bill asked to pay.

Mr. FISH. Certainly. It is earning not more than 3 per cent. The veterans must pay 4½ per cent. So instead of being a bonus, if you get down to the cold facts, it is more or less of a gold brick to the veterans. I voted for it because I believe there are a large number of unemployed World War veterans in the United States. There are 50,000 unemployed veterans in New York City alone. There are three or four hundred thousand unemployed veterans in the United States. There are more unemployed among the veterans than any other group in the United States. Although they do not exceed 3 per cent of our population, they represent 15 per cent of the unemployed. The World War veterans are between 30 and 40 years of age. They have families to support, and it is the men between those ages who are hit the hardest when there is unemployment. They have not been employed long enough to set aside a reserve fund to maintain themselves and their families without employment, which they are deprived of through no fault of their own. They are not asking charity or doles or anything that is not fair and just or what they are not entitled to.

The reason I am impelled to take this stand to-day is the fact that I hold in my hand a letter from one of the best-known women in America; a woman whose name is known throughout the length and breadth of this land as a great benefactress to our Nation and to its people. I am not going to give her name, but I am just going to quote a few sentences. She writes:

DEAR MR. FISH: In looking over the morning paper I have come to the conclusion that there are a few patriotic men and many patriotic women—

This is in regard to the passage by the House of the adjusted service bill—

I feel rather strongly in this matter because I like to believe in patriotism, but my faith in the patriotism of a great majority of the men of the country has been shaken, though I still believe we may find it among the women, unless the bad example set us by the men will corrupt the so-called weaker sex.

That letter, from one of the most prominent women in this country, is brought about solely because she has been misled by false information contained in the daily press, in the metropolitan papers, and particularly in the press of Washington and New York, which, in their editorial columns, predict increased taxation when there is no question whatever of increased taxation, because the Treasury Department will be the gainer through every loan that is made to the veterans.

I stand here willing to be challenged and permit anyone to explain how the taxes of this country will be increased by the enactment into law of the bill which the House passed the other day to permit increased loans up to 50 per cent of the face value of the certificates at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest to the veteran certificate holders. But if you read the numerous editorials that have been written for metropolitan papers, the public is naturally led to believe that the bill as passed by the House was not only a raid upon the Treasury but that we Members of the House have been derelict in our duty; that we have been afraid of some kind of soldier bloc in voting for this legislation. All we have done is to make it possible for the needy veteran, for the unemployed veteran, to make loans at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on good security or service certificates backed by the Government of the United States. Those veterans who are unemployed and whose families are in distress will make those loans. The other veterans who are not in distress will not make the loans, because they can go to the banks and get the money at 4 per cent instead of paying $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; but in spite of that the newspapers have written in such manner that the people back home, the bankers and business men generally, believe that we have done something iniquitous and have tried to disrupt the finances of the country and of the Treasury Department; that we have been cowardly; that we have sold out to the soldiers just because we have made it possible for the soldiers to make loans, with good security, at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, when the Treasury Department can refinance and borrow this money at 3 per cent. It is time those who voted for this bill had their interests protected. Let the people back home know just what the facts are. This House did not act in any cowardly fashion. They acted because they believed this to be sound and safe legislation in the interest of all people and even the Treasury Department of the United States.

MR. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. FISH. I yield.

MR. SPROUL of Kansas. Who is responsible for this fraud which the gentleman says is being practiced—this deceit?

MR. FISH. The gentleman from Kansas has used a far better word than I used. It is a fraud upon the public and a fraud against every Member of this House who voted for this bill. If there ever was a conservative measure, it is the measure that was passed recently. My only objection to it is that it is too conservative. If they had made the rate of interest 4 per cent, it would have been fairer to the veterans, and even then the Government would be the gainer. The advantage is given to the Treasury Department and not to the needy veterans, who have to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

MR. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. FISH. I yield.

MR. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact that it is even a greater fraud against those Members of the House who were prevailed upon to believe the propaganda against this bill and justified their action in voting against the bill because of that belief?

MR. FISH. I am sorry for those who voted against this bill, because I believe they were misled by this propaganda, just as this very intelligent, patriotic woman was misled by the editorials in the press in the city of Washington headed "Increased Taxes."

I do not believe any Member of the House would have voted against this bill if he or she had known the exact facts at the time we considered it and, instead, had not been misled by this false propaganda.

MR. WOODRUFF. I agree with the gentleman.

MR. HASTINGS. I hope the gentleman will insist on 3 per cent instead of 4 per cent, because the Government can refinance it at 3 per cent as well as 4 per cent.

MR. FISH. It is water that has gone over the mill, and we want to help the needy without delay. We are in the midst of a period of serious depression. I think it is far worse than we are willing to admit, and I want to give the needy veterans a chance to make increased loans on their service certificates before they and their families suffer any more privations.

In the three or four minutes remaining I want to take this opportunity to state my reasons as the Representative from the West Point district, where I was born and still live, for opposing the bill reported yesterday by the Military Affairs Committee, which provides for acquiring additional land for the Military Academy in order to further develop its activities. I am for the general proposition. I believe in West Point as the greatest Military Academy in the world and the most efficient. I am willing to grant nine-tenths of what the War Department asks. The bill calls for 15,000 acres, and I am perfectly willing to vote at any time for 14,000 acres in order to get all the water supply the Military Academy may need, target ranges, rifle ranges, and so forth. But the other 1,000 or 1,200 acres involved, located on the river front, represent a large amount of taxable property, the Morgan estate, the Satterlee estate, the Pell estate, and the Tracey estate. The War Department states it wants this land for the purpose of establishing an aviation field. If they do that, and take that property, it means the financial ruin of the town of Highlands and village of Highland Falls and of 4,000 people who live in that town and village, including the hamlet of Fort Montgomery. As a matter of justice to them and fair play that land should not be taken without adequate compensation for loss of taxes. The people and village, town, and school authorities are willing that the Government should take the other property, but you can not take out of the tax list \$20,000 annually without practically bankrupting the school district and seriously affecting the financial existence of the town and village.

If it is permissible to offer an amendment when that bill comes up and I am able to have the river-front properties omitted, I shall support the bill; but if the War Department insists on this arbitrary procedure and demands all of the land provided for in the bill, without amendment, I will be compelled, much as I regret it, to fight the bill in every legislative way I know how. I think it is the height of stupidity on the part of the War Department to insist on this procedure, when they can get nine-tenths of what they want immediately. What they need now is a watershed. We will give them that and the rifle and artillery ranges, but they do not need the aviation field immediately, and, moreover, it is not the proper place for an aviation field.

I am sorry I have not more time, because I would like to read to you some letters I have received, one from Mr. Herbert L. Satterlee, who was formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and a patriotic citizen. He denounces this procedure and states "as for the plan to make an aviation field where our house and the Tracy's and Pell's stand, it is the poorest site that could be found for it. In the first place, every aviator knows that the air conditions in the Highlands make it no place for students. You might as

well teach boys to row or sail small boats in Hell Gate. In the second place, it will be enormously expensive to make an air field there, owing to natural conditions. All together, it is the most foolish and wasteful site that could possibly be chosen."

Mr. Satterlee has asked me to vote against the bill in its present form because he believes it is entirely improper to take this land for an aviation field. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries \$59,108,419.21, and it is the last of the regular appropriation bills to be reported and passed at this term. At this time I will not attempt to say anything relative to the items in this bill. As a matter of fact, there is nothing controversial in it. At a later time I expect to have something to say, if I have the opportunity, in a nonpartisan way, relative to the appropriations made by this Congress during the past two years. About 34 or 35 years ago I recall that there was a great deal said over the country about the fact that the Congress at that time had appropriated during its two years \$1,000,000,000. It was called the billion-dollar Congress. It is impossible to say how much this Congress will have appropriated during the two years of its existence until after all the bills have been finally passed and enacted into law, but if the bills which are now pending are finally enacted into law, I think it may be said that this will be what can be called a \$10,000,000,000 Congress. I am satisfied from such information as I have that the appropriations which have been made during the past two years, or which will have been made during the past two years, will amount to more than \$10,000,000,000, and possibly in the neighborhood of \$10,500,000,000.

When we consider the fact that we are facing a deficit—which some of us said last December would amount to between \$400,000,000 and \$500,000,000, without taking into consideration some legislation recently passed—it seems to me the enormous appropriations made by this Congress emphasize the absolute necessity of greatest economy upon the part of the House during the next Congress.

There is nothing partisan in the making of appropriations and there should not be. There is no partisanship in the Appropriations Committee with reference to the consideration of appropriations, and my appeal is to both sides of the Chamber. In my judgment the rapidity with which appropriations have been increased in the past two years demands that Congress be a little more circumspect in the future with reference to the bills which are passed. They may not show on their face any immediate necessity for the appropriation of any large additional funds, but in nearly every instance they constitute a future and a continuing charge upon the Government which will have to be taken care of during all the future years.

I think it fair to say that in the matter of economy, which I believe is going to be one of the most important issues before the next Congress, the House of Representatives is the only arm or branch of the Government to which the people can look for real relief. I say this in view of the past record. I do not think it unfair to say that the House has not had much help along that line from the administration and the various departments of this Government, because all of these appropriations, amounting, as I say, to more than \$10,000,000,000, have been recommended and asked of Congress by the administration, including increases of salaries, which have been denied. It has actually asked much more because Congress has never failed to reduce its estimates. We also know that there is not an appropriation bill which leaves the House of Representatives and goes to another body at the other end of the Capitol to which there is not added millions of dollars in excess of the amount provided by the House.

I said a while ago that we frequently pass bills which constitute a continuing charge upon the Government. I have in mind one bill, a simple little bill, which was passed by this Congress. In that bill it was provided that a lot owned by the Government in the rear of the Pan American Building be donated to the Pan American Building for an office building.

It was simple on its face and seemed to be a generous act, involving no expense to the Government, save the value of a vacant lot. But as a result this bill carries an appropriation of \$750,000, made necessary because the Government has to move from the lot the heating plant which takes care of the War, the Navy, and other Government activities and erect it on another site.

I could cite many instances of this kind and I have referred to this one in these brief remarks for the purpose of calling it to the attention of the Members on both sides of the aisle, as showing the necessity of a closer supervision of our expenditures in the next Congress than we have had in this Congress. Undoubtedly Congress has got to do something to hold down these appropriations—possibly they can not be reduced—or you have got to pile up more taxes on the American people in order to take care of them. As I have said, this is shown by the fact we have probably a half billion dollar deficit staring the Government in the face on June 30.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. May I inquire of the gentleman what agency of the Government is responsible for the donation of this lot. It must have required some approval by the legislative branch.

Mr. BYRNS. I think it is the custom of all the legislative committees to send such bills down to the Bureau of the Budget for its approval or disapproval or such recommendation as it may desire to make. I am not advised whether the Bureau of the Budget recommended this or not. However, the Congress passed the bill, and I take it, in the last analysis, Congress is responsible for the appropriation that is required.

I have said this much because I feel that something must be done to hold down the ever-increasing appropriations of the Federal Government. There is no more important service which the next Congress can render.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. And is not the tendency increasing year after year to give too much credit and credence and consideration to the requests of the departments of government?

Mr. BYRNS. I think the gentleman is clearly right, because in the last analysis the House of Representatives—and I think this can be demonstrated by our experience in the past few years—is the only arm or branch of government, if I may call it that, to which the people may look for real economy.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. And it is the only branch responsible direct to the people in the expenditure of public money.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, in his annual message to Congress on its convening in December, 1929, advised the Congress that there would be a surplus of about \$225,000,000 at the close of the fiscal year, 1930, and there was indicated a further surplus of about \$123,000,000 for the fiscal year 1931. He then stated that the Congress would be fully justified in giving the benefits of these prospective surpluses to certain classes of taxpayers, and recommended that the normal income-tax rates applicable to the income of individuals for the calendar year 1929 be reduced from 5, 3, and 1½ per cent to 4, 2, and one-half of 1 per cent, and that the tax on the incomes of corporations for the calendar year 1929 be reduced from 12 to 11 per cent. He advised the Congress that the cost to the Government of this gift to these income-tax payers would amount to about \$160,000,000. The message of the President was read to the House and Senate on the 3d day of December and on the next day, Mr. HAWLEY, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, reported a bill carrying out the suggestions of the President, and on the following day the bill passed the House. The Senate very promptly considered the bill and passed it on December 14, and it became law on the 18th day of December.

While this bill was labeled "tax reduction bill," it was in reality a gratuity out of the public Treasury to approximately 2,440,000 taxpayers. Their taxes were almost due. Individuals had made expenditures knowing the amount of taxes that would be required of them and the corporations had fixed prices of articles that they had to sell upon the basis of existing income-tax laws, and while this contribution was most welcome, it nevertheless was a gift to them by a generous Government.

Mr. RAMSEYER, a prominent Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in discussing the resolution says:

The Congress by this resolution cancels a part of the debt that each income-tax payer owes to the Government—

And so forth.

A prominent Democratic Member, Mr. RANKIN of the House in discussing it says:

You propose now at the end of the year, when the masses of the American people have paid this money into the treasuries of those who are able to pay income taxes, to remit it—to pay a bonus, as it were, to those income-tax payers, the people, I submit who are most able to pay. * * * Not only this, Mr. Chairman, but the masses of the American people will not be reached by this reduction, but only the favored few.

The real reason the President submitted this proposal to Congress, and that Congress with lightning speed adopted it, was because in October there occurred a crash in the stock market and billions of dollars were lost as a result, and the President and the Congress felt that by making this donation to business men and corporations the situation would be partially relieved and a speedier recovery would thereby result.

I have no quarrel with the President for suggesting it or with Congress for adopting it. I merely want to emphasize the thought that the passage of this bill carried benefits involving \$160,000,000 to certain taxpayers.

After the lapse of a year or a little better another class of our citizens found themselves in a still worse predicament. They are suffering from an economic condition that has destroyed the prices of the commodities that they have to sell, and added to this has been a period of drought which has prevented them from raising normal crops and they are now suffering from hunger and cold and want. Not since the living can remember has such a condition existed in the territory that I represent, and I am reliably informed that the condition in my State prevails in about 21 other States. Conditions may be worse in some of them and slightly better in others. Banks have failed as a result. Business men who have been prosperous in the past are without funds, manufacturers have discharged their employees, and a general period of depression and pessimism and poverty prevails. Farmers do not have money with which to buy food for themselves and their children. A large part of their livestock has died. Conditions can best be described as deplorable.

The States and communities affected could not entirely supply the needs, and a general demand was made on the Congress to appropriate sufficient money to provide aid to these stricken people, aid necessary to relieve hunger and want, aid necessary to feed their livestock, aid sufficient to enable them to buy seeds to plant in the coming year. Congress has done substantially nothing. Bills to provide loans have passed, and loans are available only to those who can provide ample security to the Government for them, and the amounts appropriated will supply but a small part of the needs of millions of American citizens who must pawn their small possessions to secure the Government loans. Those of our citizens without property or ample security will receive no benefit whatever by this congressional action. Any suggestion of an appropriation to give relief to these unfortunate people has been frowned down upon by the President of the United States whose wishes Congress has seen fit to follow. Congressional appropriations have been made for over 100 years to relieve suffering and distress, not only in this country but in foreign countries as well, but the proposal now is labeled "charity" and a "dole," and the un-

fortunate and helpless men, women, and children are slandered and insulted because direct Government aid has been suggested to relieve this distress. I can not see the difference in providing aid through direct appropriations to the hungry and needy of our own citizens and similar appropriations to the needy of foreign lands. It seems to me that if one is to be preferred American citizens should be that one. I likewise can not see the difference in providing direct aid to victims of hurricanes and victims of a drought. Both are acts of nature beyond the control of man.

The Red Cross is a semigovernmental organization created by Federal statute for the relief of suffering by war, pestilence, famine, flood, fire, and other great calamities. Its purpose likewise is—

To devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, and generally to promote measures of humanity and the welfare of mankind.

The Red Cross to-day is a rich and powerful institution, with its management largely in the hands of men and women of wealth and influence. The executive and judicial branches of the Government are represented in its management—only the legislative is ignored. It too was slow, in spite of its vast resources and available supplies, to seriously consider the widespread hunger and want that stalks over the land. It has assumed somewhat the same attitude toward this condition as that of the President of the United States, who is likewise the president of the Red Cross. I have in my hand the Red Cross Courier of December 1 and December 15, 1930, and no mention was made of drought relief in either issue.

Congress seems to have been advised of its seriousness ahead of the Red Cross. It seems obvious that the discussion of it by Congress caused the management of the Red Cross to begin its belated efforts to relieve conditions. This seems apparent when we consider a statement by Mr. De Witt Smith, assistant national director of the Red Cross, which appeared in the Red Cross Courier of January 1, 1931, which is as follows:

As a result of 50 years' experience in distress relief work, the Red Cross developed a policy of not attempting to extend relief through the national organization in strikes, business depressions, failures of crops, and other forms of unemployment and economic maladjustments. These have been considered a part of the economic hazard to which agriculture and industry are alike subject from time to time.

So I feel that I am warranted in saying that the suffering men, women, and children would perhaps have been entirely ignored by the American Red Cross had it not been for speeches made on the floor of this House and on the floor of the United States Senate. [Applause.] Because it is apparent to me that the American Red Cross felt that it was not its duty to come to the relief of suffering humanity when that suffering was caused by drought.

Although this national disaster has prevailed since early in last year, only slight notice of it has been given in the columns of the official journal of the Red Cross until last month. Congress seems to have sensed the situation earlier than the Red Cross.

The President and the Congress has said to poor suffering men, women, and children that direct Government aid must not be given and that suffering humanity must not ask for aid or expect it; and the Red Cross, an organization created solely for the purpose of relieving suffering humanity, openly asserts that these suffering people should not expect assistance from them because starvation and misery that come from drought is an economic hazard that the vocation must expect and suffer when it comes. I would not believe that the management of a great organization such as the Red Cross would sanction such a doctrine were it not published in the official publication of the National Red Cross.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. PARKS. There has been a great deal said about the cost of administering relief by the Red Cross. I will be glad if the gentleman will tell us what it costs to collect and distribute the money, and if he has a list of the salaries of people who are in the Red Cross, how much they receive,

also the value of Red Cross property throughout the United States.

Mr. COLLINS. Answering part of the gentleman's first question, it is practically impossible by reading their published financial statements appearing in their annual reports, to tell the amount of the overhead. But in their latest annual report—ending June 30, 1930—there appears the following "Budget for fiscal year ending 1931," which, I take, applies to overhead. This item is \$4,470,224.07.

In regard to salaries the Red Cross operates not only through its national organization but likewise through chapter organizations, and while all its funds belong to the national organization, a certain amount is carried in the treasuries of the chapters.

In the national organization there are 990 employees. Of these, 439 are in the national headquarters in the city of Washington. The rest are distributed in various branches and departments.

The salaries of these employees are reported in a very peculiar way and are as follows:

Salaries ranging from \$12,000 to \$15,000, 1; \$7,300 and under \$12,000, 7; \$6,000 and under \$7,300, 7; \$5,000 and under \$6,000, 13; \$4,000 and under \$5,000, 20; \$3,000 and under \$4,000, 61; \$2,500 and under \$3,000, 96; \$2,000 and under \$2,500, 191; \$1,500 and under \$2,000, 262; \$1,000 and under \$1,500, 244; \$600 and under \$1,000, 73; under \$600, 15.

Mr. PARKS. Has the gentleman any statistics showing the value of real estate owned by the Red Cross?

Mr. COLLINS. The report shows that the Red Cross has at various places 13 buildings or real-estate holdings. Those buildings or real estate are listed at \$1 each. The value of those buildings or holdings is not considered in the assets of the Red Cross that I shall present in a few minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Where are these persons employed by the Red Cross?

Mr. COLLINS. The table I have quoted from appears on page 192 of the last annual report of the Red Cross. They are employees of the national organization.

Mr. MICHENER. That includes, does it not, workers for the Red Cross in the various counties and cities?

Mr. COLLINS. No. It does not. Chapter employees are not included, nor are the volunteer workers who render such splendid service throughout the country.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to say I will guarantee that if there is any information desired with reference to the matters under discussion not contained in the printed report it will be promptly supplied on application by Judge Payne, chairman of the Red Cross.

Will the gentleman also let me say one further thing, because I think it ought to be said? Judge Payne has not received and has never received one cent in compensation for his services. He has not even received one cent toward the expenses which he has incurred in traveling in this country and in traveling abroad. I think it is fair to the very able, the very honest, and very distinguished man who has figured largely in the public service to say that much.

Mr. COLLINS. I am very glad that the gentleman from Virginia has seen fit to state that Judge Payne has worked without salary and that he has not permitted the Red Cross to reimburse him for his traveling expenses. As to Judge Payne's testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am afraid he was not at that time fully advised as to the assets of the Red Cross.

As the situation grew worse and the plight of the people became better known to Congress congressional committees called Judge John Barton Payne, the chairman of the National Red Cross, before them to testify in order to find out what, if anything, the Red Cross was doing for the relief of suffering humanity. Judge Payne advised the Senate Appropriations Committee on January 6 that the Red Cross had at its disposal approximately four and a half millions

of dollars, and if directed would use it for the relief of distress. The Senators who heard Judge Payne testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee stated on the floor of the Senate that he testified only four and a half millions of dollars was available for relief of distress existing throughout the country. In order to acquaint myself with the financial condition of the Red Cross I have gone over the annual reports of this institution for the past 10 years.

I have also asked the Chief of Finance of the War Department to furnish me with a financial statement of the Red Cross and I have also examined a statement prepared by James K. McClintock vice chairman in charge of finance of the Red Cross, and given by him to the Peoples' Legislative Service, and I learn from these sources that at the time the statement was made by Judge Payne before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the Red Cross had assets of over \$40,000,000. The statement furnished me by the office of Chief of Finance of the War Department is as follows:

General fund.....	\$16,412,897.19
Reserve.....	5,000,000.00
Endowment fund.....	6,232,393.37
	27,645,290.56
Chapter.....	7,700,000.00
Exclusive of current revenues.....	8,800,000.00
	44,145,000.00

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does that include real estate which the gentleman referred to?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Has the gentleman any idea as to the value of the real estate?

Mr. COLLINS. The value of the real estate owned or under the control of the Red Cross is carried on the books of the Red Cross—13 buildings—at \$1 each, or \$13.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How much does the gentleman think those buildings are really worth?

Mr. COLLINS. I have no idea, but I do know that they are very valuable.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have received some requests for information that will support the statements made in the press with reference to an article sent out from Washington that the Red Cross had over \$40,000,000. Can the gentleman state whether some of these endowments or trust funds left to the Red Cross carry any proviso with reference to the use of that money? That is, whether the principal could be used, or only the interest.

Mr. COLLINS. The item that the gentleman refers to aggregates \$6,232,393.37.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That amount is all that is tied up?

Mr. COLLINS. The item could not be said to be entirely tied up, but I have eliminated it in my discussion of their assets available for use because I want to be entirely fair.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is the information I have been seeking for several weeks.

The statement of Mr. McClintock furnished to the People's Legislative Service, of which I have a photostatic copy, is as follows:

Balances in funds invested.....	\$4,600,000
Endowment.....	11,000,000
Chapter and branch fund, 17,000 items.....	7,700,000
Appropriated for drought.....	5,000,000
Committed.....	4,800,000
	33,100,000
Expected revenues.....	8,800,000
	41,900,000
Spent to January 31, 1931.....	2,100,000
	44,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. If the endowment fund of \$6,232,393.37 and the budget for fiscal fund for year 1931 of \$4,479,224.07 are deducted, this would still leave available for expenditure for the relief of suffering of approximately \$33,500,000, and this amount is exclusive of the \$10,000,000 that is now being raised for the sole purpose of relieving distress.

Most of the assets of the Red Cross are invested in stocks and bonds that are yielding a return on the investment, and it is very proper that its funds be invested in interest-bearing securities, but these funds have been donated by the public for the purpose of enabling the Red Cross to carry out the purposes for which it was created, to wit: Alleviation of suffering and distress in peace and war. A period of distress and suffering has arrived and the Red Cross should go its whole limit in relieving it, even though it has to sell a part of its securities or all of them to give the needed relief.

I do not believe that the generous-hearted membership of this great organization will countenance what appears to be an effort on the part of its management to secrete or hide its vast resources. I believe that these generous-hearted people of America desire a truthful financial statement from the management of the Red Cross. I believe that they want this management to relieve suffering and human misery now, even though it takes the last dollar of the assets of the organization. I furthermore believe that such an attitude will appeal to a generous public, and the Red Cross in the end will be the gainer by such a policy. The Red Cross advertises itself to the world as the "mother of humanity." Its attitude in this emergency will prove or disprove this claim. In the language of Judge Payne himself—

The present disaster appears to overshadow that of the Mississippi Valley flood relief of 1927, the greatest peace-time calamity in Red Cross experience.

To meet this great calamity the central committee of the Red Cross—which refused to accept the Senate appropriation of \$25,000,000—should appropriate at once an additional \$15,000,000 from its substantial surplus.

A resolution has been introduced in the Senate by Senator BRATTON, of New Mexico, to the effect that it is the sense of the Senate that the Red Cross should appropriate \$15,000,000 out of its surplus in addition to that which it has stated that it contemplates expending for present disaster relief in the United States. I hope this resolution will pass. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the time allotted me to discuss briefly some matters relating to our Federal land-bank system, or, more particularly, the branch of the system known as Federal land banks.

Of course, the entire country recognizes the unfortunate developments that have come about in the commercial banking system of the Nation, because all classes of citizens are interested and affected. It is well understood that our commercial banking system has broken down in many sections of the Nation. Strangling processes have been turned on and perpetuated in the administration of our commercial banking until the small bank in small communities—community banking as we have known it in days gone by—is practically destroyed in the United States. We have had more than 1,300 bank failures in the last year.

The number is increasing every day and nothing is being done about it by those who ought to be most concerned over the situation, except to continue and to accentuate the policies that are in large part responsible for these developments.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. I beg to be excused for the moment. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman later if I have the time. Some of us who are members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House have warned our banking authorities for 10 years of what they were bringing on, but

we were told all along that the only difficulty was in the smaller communities there were not brains enough to conduct independent banks successfully; that only in the larger cities could be found men who were competent for the task. Recently all that contention has been somewhat exploded. We witnessed in the great financial center of New York, a few weeks ago, the spectacle of a large bank failure, and the superbankers in New York calling upon a politician from Tammany Hall, the mayor of the city, to restore confidence in the financial leaders of Wall Street, and to appeal to the public to trust the big bankers of New York. We witnessed right here in the city of Washington a few days ago a scene with which you are familiar, a run on a large banking institution, somewhat typical of occurrences that have become common in many sections of the country. Bankers rushed to the relief of the institution in Washington. One banker, whom I respect and admire, because he is a progressive, brilliant fellow, seems to believe in the guaranty of bank deposits. Anyway, he rushed up with a half million dollars, waving it before the crowd to assure them that their deposits would be protected.

But I do not desire to enlarge upon the situation that confronts us in connection with our commercial banks. Nor do I wish to discuss our system of joint-stock land banks. All of us understand that nearly all these banks are wrecked and have ceased to function in so far as service to farmers is concerned. I want to talk for a while about the Federal land-bank system.

Members of the House from agricultural sections are of course familiar with what is going on, and no doubt all Members are to some extent, but certainly those of us who represent distressed agricultural communities know the conditions that exist there. I measure my words when I declare that our Federal land-bank system is breaking down and headed in a direction that will bring great disappointment to all of us who are really interested in the system if something is not done. Recently the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, conducted hearings on a bill which I introduced and which I shall explain before I conclude, and we discussed various phases of this situation, and we attempted to secure information that would enable us to understand fully the condition of each of these banks. Probably we did secure some information, but not by any means all that was needed. I am not in position to give you a complete picture of the condition of these banks, because of the fact that the information was not made available. Recently the Senate passed a resolution calling on the Federal Farm Loan Board for specific and complete information disclosing the conditions of the various land banks, but so far the Senate has not obtained the facts called for in its resolution on this subject. Members of the Federal Farm Loan Board came before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, voicing the views of the Secretary of the Treasury, who also submitted letters opposing all legislation proposed. The Federal Farm Loan Board asked at one stage of the inquiry that the hearings be conducted in executive session. That was agreed upon. Because of the delicacy of banking business and the timidity of capital and credit as it affects the operation of the land banks, I expect for the present, at least, to observe the understanding with reference to what took place in executive session. But public records show that seven of the Federal land banks are no longer paying dividends.

It is well known that one of these banks was involved in serious difficulty some years ago which necessitated action upon the part of the other 11 banks to secure the obligations and maintain the solvency of that bank. I refer to the Spokane Federal Land Bank. The other banks put up three or four million dollars, as I remember, to help pull that bank out of the hole, and this debt to the other land banks has never been liquidated. But seven of these banks are not paying dividends, and, of course, anybody who knows anything of banking can understand that in such condition they are not in position to float bonds and obtain funds with which to continue normal operations. The only thing

that enables them to carry on at all is because of the co-operative feature of the Federal farm loan act which makes each land bank responsible for the bonds of all of the other banks. When we talk to the Farm Loan Board and seek information they give us figures disclosing the condition of the entire system of banks. When we sought to find out the condition of each individual bank and how its operations are being carried on we did not get anywhere. Our committee—not through the Federal Farm Loan Board, but through the local banking authorities—did get specific information on some points in connection with the Federal land bank in the fifth district, and that report showed that 20 per cent of the number of borrowers of that bank were delinquent and 30 per cent of the number of loans were delinquent. That bank has taken over 217,407 acres of land, representing \$2,892,000 plus, and conditions are growing worse and will for months to come. It was frankly stated or admitted that that bank is not in position to function if left to stand on its own resources. The same condition is necessarily true of the major number of these banks. Certainly six or seven of the Federal land banks are in that condition. The bonds, when offered by the system as a whole, guaranteed by all of the land banks, are really not marketable and have not been for quite some time. The 4 per cent bonds are down to 89, as I remember. The 4½ per cent bonds are down to 95 and the 4¾ per cent bonds a little above that. They floated \$20,000,000 last November at 4½ per cent, netting 99 per cent, but they were short-time bonds and not sold to be carried over a period of years as contemplated should be done in the practical operation of the banks.

They had borrowed before that, not by floating bonds as had been the custom and as contemplated by the Federal farm loan act, but through the Federal reserve banks, and they used part of the returns from this short-time borrowing of \$20,000,000 issue to repay what they owed the Federal reserve banks. In November of 1928 they sold \$15,000,000 of bonds and in June they sold \$25,000,000, but since that time no regular bond sales have been made; they are resorting to the sale of obligations of short-time maturity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. The practical situation is that the Federal land banks are not able to market their securities at fair prices and, therefore, they are not able to continue their operations except in a limited way. Their reserves have been depleted in some of these banks. The law requires each land bank to carry valid mortgages as security for bonds issued and they are not permitted to carry anything against those bonds except land-bank bonds or Government bonds. So the officers of the banks insist that when they find themselves in this situation they have no alternative but to turn on a system of arbitrary foreclosures and enforced collections. That is what is being done, as shown in the report which we obtained from one of the land banks, the fifth district bank, and it is being done in several others. It is going on in your district, Mr. HARE, and in several other land-bank districts.

The administration of our farm-loan system is resulting in oppression to the farmers who have obtained loans through the land banks. All over the section I represent the court-houses at the county seats are marked by advertisements of lands being foreclosed by the Federal land bank, and everybody knows that in the situation that exists now there are no purchasers for foreclosed farms in large numbers. They are being sacrificed at great loss to the banks and at horrible and inexcusable hardships upon the farmers of the country who have borrowed from these banks. The officers of the land banks insist this must be done in order to protect the outstanding bonds of the banks.

It was a legislative oversight that in creating the land-bank system we did not provide for a surplus or reserve fund in each of these banks, but we failed to do it. The Government subscribed the initial capital of \$750,000 for each of these banks, which was automatically reimbursed to

the Government as the stock of the banks was taken over by the borrowers. Under the law each borrower is required to take 5 per cent of his loan in stock, and when the stock reached the amount subscribed by the Government the Treasury was reimbursed, and the Government no longer has any bonds or stock of these banks. There is a trivial amount of this stock that has not been taken up, but it is of no importance, and the Veterans' Bureau has some bonds that they are holding as an investment, but the Treasury has no more of the stock or bonds of these land banks. The Government held a large amount of these bonds at one time, but the Treasury officials asked for legislation to permit the purchase in order to keep land-bank bonds off the market in competition with Government bonds.

Now, we are told by the Federal Farm Loan Board that the system, as a whole, is solvent and can float its bonds. As a matter of fact these bonds can not be marketed now at fair rates and long-term maturity. But, regardless of this, anybody can understand that where a bank gets in a hole, with its reserves depleted, and finds itself unable to continue its operations upon a sound basis, upon its own resources, it inevitably follows that the other banks of the system that must bear the burden when that happens, and the Federal Farm Loan Board, which supervises the system, will say to such a bank, you are becoming a burden; you are endangering the safety of the system; we want you to slow down on loans and be more active in making collections. The result is that such a bank ceases to serve the farmers as it was intended to serve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Various proposals have been offered to deal with this situation, some creating a straight moratorium and others providing for loans from the Treasury to take care of installments on mortgages. I introduced a bill that I think will afford the relief that is needed. It is the most conservative bill that was offered. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, is hereby amended by adding at the end of said section 32 another section to be known as section 32-A, as follows:

"SEC. 32-A. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon request of any Federal land bank and the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to advance or loan to such Federal land bank, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000, to be used by the bank as a special reserve fund and to enable such Federal land bank to defer the institution of mortgage foreclosures when, in the judgment of its directors, it will be to the best interests of the bank and its borrowers to do so. Such Federal land bank shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury a certificate of indebtedness or its note for moneys so loaned or advanced hereunder bearing a rate of interest not to exceed the current rate paid by the Government on its obligations, and said bank shall annually or semiannually apply to the payment of such obligation or obligations an amount equal to one-fifth of its annual net earnings until the entire amount has been repaid to the Government."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately upon its approval.

The plan provides that the Treasury shall make advances to each of the Federal land banks in the sum of \$5,000,000 upon the request of the Federal Farm Loan Board and the officials of the bank—this amount to be used to replenish the reserves of the bank and to be reimbursed to the Treasury only out of the net earnings of the bank. It is not to be counted as an obligation along with their bonds. It is not a charge in any sense of the word against the bank except against net earnings which, of course, if we save the system, the banks will ultimately be prepared to repay to the Government. That measure follows the philosophy of the Federal farm loan act and the plan under which we took care of the initial capital when we inaugurated this system. Members of the Federal Farm Loan Board agree that if we are to have any relief for these banks, my bill offers a practical way to do it. It would simply give the officials of these banks a larger latitude and enable them

to handle the affairs of the banks in a common-sense way and not turn on an automatic system of foreclosures, involving losses to the banks and unnecessary suffering to the borrowers. No other institution in the world employs such methods and no other banking system is operated in such an unbusinesslike manner. It is working ruin to the banks and intolerable hardships upon the borrowers, and it ought not to be done.

The administration is opposed to this bill but they offer nothing as a substitute. They oppose all legislation offered and insist that no aid is needed—that they can work out all difficulties without assistance.

I submit to the membership of this House who are familiar with the condition of the Federal land banks that they not only need but they must have assistance from some source and a change in the methods of operation if we are to save the system as an instrumentality of service to the farmers of the country. It ought to be done, but it is not going to be done, and you gentlemen who are interested in the matter should understand the situation. The purpose of my speaking to you this afternoon is that the House may know what is going on and that Members may understand the responsibility that confronts us.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HARE. Are we to understand from the information being furnished now by the gentleman, who is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the House need not expect any relief legislation from the committee at this session of Congress?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman may so understand. As long as the present Treasury control is continued nothing will be done, unless Congress will take hold of the matter and provide the necessary relief. That is the situation we are in.

Mr. HARE. The point I wanted to make is this. It appeared from the gentleman's statement that the responsibility is with the House, or with the Members of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. When I say the Members of the House, of course, I mean the leadership that is responsible for what is done in Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand it, in the hearing before the committee—and, as the gentleman recalls, I appeared there in favor of the principles of his bill—the chief objection we heard was that it might create some instability in the value of the bonds because the interest would not be paid. As I understand, the gentleman's bill is simply for the purpose of having a fund with which to guarantee the payment of interest on the bonds of the land banks.

Mr. STEAGALL. Absolutely that. Of course, nothing could be more ridiculous, and I use the word ridiculous advisedly, than to say that it would discredit these bonds for the investing public to find out that the Government of the United States intended to protect and perpetuate the land-bank system and to make the Federal farm loan act an effective piece of legislation. The bill would furnish necessary funds for a common-sense administration of the banks and would serve notice on the investing public that the Government intends to make the farm-loan system a success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I desire to insert extracts from a couple of letters here. I want, Members of the House, to read you what is going on, and then I shall be pleased to yield. My colleague from Alabama who is interested and anxious to secure for the farmers of his district the benefits to which they are entitled.

I read an extract from a letter sent out by the Houston Land Bank, and I have another one from the New Orleans bank. Of course, the policy outlined is in force in all the banks. The system is being run by the Federal Farm Loan

Board in Washington. The borrowers own it, but they do not run it. Here is the extract from a letter sent out from the Houston Land Bank:

All borrowers and officers of the Land Bank Association should understand it is a waste of time to ask an extension. If one can not pay, then he should sell his farm to one who can and will.

The New Orleans Land Bank has a letter of similar import. I quote from it:

In view of this condition we are compelled to adopt a policy that demands immediate payment of all items due on a loan as they mature. We have the necessary means at our disposal to enforce this policy, and suitable preparation has been made to take definite action on all loans where payment of any item has been neglected or delayed.

That is what is going on. It is unwise, harsh, hurtful, and destructive both to the land banks and to borrowers. There is no well-managed business institution in the world that does not make preparation for the hour of misfortune and depression such as confronts the people of the country today.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I suppose those who are opposing the gentleman's legislation contend that the distress we are now in will soon pass away, and that this is responsible for the condition of the bank?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; of course, our land-bank system is not an emergency system, but every business that is operated intelligently attempts to meet emergencies when they arise, and the land-bank system should be administered in a common-sense way like other institutions.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Like the other banks of the country.

Mr. STEAGALL. Like the other banks of the country, which are required to maintain surplus accounts and are accustomed to grant extensions to customers when good business judgment dictates that it be done. The \$5,000,000 fund provided in my bill for each land bank, while not sufficient to meet the situation fully, would relieve these banks to a large extent and would enable them to function in a normal way.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What would the gentleman do—extend the time or grant additional credit?

Mr. STEAGALL. We should not extend any loan unless it ought to be extended; but let each bank deal with individual cases as they arise, which can be done if we will equip them with additional reserves to enable them to administer their affairs in a common-sense way and not follow the harsh policy of sacrificing the homes of people who have loans with the banks, and involving the banks in unnecessary losses. That is exactly what is being done now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It seems to me that if the farmers are in default in the payment of their interest or if the time has expired for the payment of the debt, the only relief that can be extended to them is to grant them additional time.

Mr. STEAGALL. The banks can give them two years under existing law, but the difficulty is that their reserves are depleted, and the officials of the banks take the position that they must collect in order to maintain valid mortgages against their outstanding bonds. The only practical way to meet the situation is through a replenishment of their reserves which I have attempted to provide for in my bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I did not come on the floor to-day with the intention of entering into a discussion regarding the farm-loan system. I do think it is unfortunate, in the present condition of the country, to have statements go out from the floor of Congress that the farm-loan banks of this country are not functioning and are practically bankrupt, and I am forced to deny such report.

I did not expect as a Republican to have to defend this great system of farm-loan banks that was built up by the Democratic Party. But I do want to state positively that

the Federal loan-bank system is sound. [Applause.] My good friend from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] undoubtedly has a lot of distress in his district, undoubtedly has a lot of farmers that can not pay the interest on their loans. That situation exists very frequently, not only with regard to the Federal loan banks but in all classes of banks, and especially under present conditions; and we have passed a lot of legislation trying to relieve that condition. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] introduced a bill in the House that came before our Committee on Banking and Currency providing for an increase of capital stock of these banks by \$60,000,000—\$5,000,000 to each bank.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield? I am sure he does not want to misquote me.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. My bill does not increase the capital stock; it provides for an addition to the reserve fund.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. It is additional capital.

Mr. STEAGALL. No; it is not in any sense whatever; it is an addition to the reserve fund.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Well, we discussed the bill in our committee for two or three days, and the Federal Farm Loan Board came before us and said the system did need such funds that our discussion of this question was bringing letters from their field agents out in the various land-bank districts, saying that our consideration of such legislation was retarding the collection of loans and interest and doing the system much harm.

A good many other such bills were introduced and referred to our committee, some providing for postponement in the collection of loans and postponement in the collection of interest, some even postponing the collection of interest for two years.

Everyone knows that none were considered seriously, as such legislation with regard to the operation of a bank would bring discredit and trouble to such bank. The bill of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] was given consideration because of the high regard we had for him, he being the ranking minority member of our committee.

However, when the testimony was all in members of the Farm Loan Board came before us and said, "We do not want this legislation; we have all the money we need to make all just and desirable loans that are applied for. We are in a position to extend payments of interest where the same are justified. We do not lack for funds. In the depressed times of last November we offered \$20,000,000 worth of bonds for sale, and they were oversubscribed at a small fraction below par. We also receive each year about \$40,000,000 in repayment of amortized loans. This discussion before this committee asking that Congress extend the payment of interest due the banks is hurting our collections and hurting the banks. We ask you not to pass that legislation."

Now, why did the board take that position? The board knew these bills were largely political. That the banks are sound. That they have funds to make all just loans. That they are not forced to foreclose any loan through lack of funds. That they are extending time for payments due when conditions justify it and that foreclosures are only ordered when conditions make the same necessary.

It is not true that the Federal farm-loan banks are without funds or are unable to secure all the funds needed to make safe loans.

The Federal farm-loan banks are sound. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR].

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, the Federal farm land banking system is not bankrupt but at the same time it is operating on a very low amount of reserve compared with their assets and liabilities. The assets of the Federal land banks are \$1,298,000,000 and the liabilities of course are the same, but the amount of mortgage loans of the Federal farm land bank system is \$1,187,000,000 and their liabilities in the shape of bonds, \$1,184,000,000, showing that they have

but \$3,000,000 more of assets compared with the amount of bonds as liabilities. The Federal land bank system has functioned well in some parts of the country, as the gentleman [Mr. STEAGALL] has told you, and yet it remains a fact that, as he states, several of the banks have not been able to properly function within the last two years. Many bills were before the Banking and Currency Committee which proposed to lend assistance to the banks, so that mortgages might not be foreclosed at this time. We all know that if there ever was a time when a borrower could not pay his money without an extension probably it is now. There is a greater number now than have existed for a decade. Many bills are before the Banking and Currency Committee. Some of them propose that all loans be extended for a year and no foreclosures effected in a year's time. Others propose no foreclosures within two years. Mr. STEAGALL introduced a bill that met my approval, and I was very glad to vote that it be considered in the House, although it did not receive a majority of the votes of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG] has told you that the Federal Farm Land Bank Board said there was no necessity for any more money, that they had ample credit upon which they could borrow upon their bonds.

He failed to state, however, that the last bonds sold were short-term bonds, and it is very doubtful if any long-term bonds could be sold at this time which would receive a price justifying the sale. Mr. STEAGALL's bill did not propose to increase the stock of the Federal land banks, and I was told by one connected with the Federal land banks that the Steagall bill would be a fine bill providing it did not allow the impression to go abroad in the country that everybody was permitted to delay the repayment of their loans for one year's time or two years' time, but if it could be enacted into law and if it was judiciously administered it would be of benefit to the Federal farm land banks of the United States and borrowers who are not able to pay now, although the security is good when the market is not panicky. All Mr. STEAGALL's bill proposed was that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized and be directed, upon the request of any Federal land bank—and now, mind you, see how it is guarded—and the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to advance or loan to such Federal land bank, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000. We have 12 Federal farm land banks. Any one of them, upon the approval not only of their own board of directors but also upon the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, would be permitted to borrow from the United States \$5,000,000. This \$5,000,000 was to bear interest at something like the interest paid by the Government on its own obligations, so that the Government would not have been out any money in loaning this to the various banks.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Is it not true that members of the Farm Board came before our committee and said that not a bank was asking for any help and that they did not need it? Is not that true?

Mr. DUNBAR. They wanted to create that impression.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Is not that what they said?

Mr. DUNBAR. No; not exactly.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. What did they say?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WASON. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNBAR. They admitted that some of the banks were hard pressed for money, but that the system as a whole did not need the money, and if not they need not apply for the loan. Let me give you an instance. Louisville, Ky., has jurisdiction over the State of Indiana, and they are pressing the people in Indiana to pay their mortgage loans now due.

Those people are not in a position to pay them, and they can not pay them, but if the Federal Land Bank of Louisville was to borrow \$5,000,000 from the Federal Treasury and pay the Federal Treasury interest on that money, they could use their discretion where they thought the loan was good and quietly extend the time for a year, and in that

manner the foreclosure would not be effected, and they would not obtain an incumbrance in the way of a farm which to-day can not be realized on, and by being able in the use of good judgment to extend the time on some of these loans, in the end the borrower and the bank would have been benefited.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. But they said they did not need the money in order to extend the loans or interest due on loans.

Mr. DUNBAR. It does not make any difference what they say in the matter. I know that in Indiana they are embarrassing farmers who are trying to borrow money to save their homes and I know that if they were given another year's time it would be beneficial to both the Federal Land Bank of Louisville, and also to the borrowers who live in Indiana.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The gentleman need not tell me anything about people being embarrassed because of borrowed money. I have been so embarrassed all my life.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. They are actually foreclosing on many farms in Tennessee now.

Mr. DUNBAR. They are actually foreclosing on many farms in Indiana. I know of an instance where a man was in comfortable circumstances for the county in which he lived. He very foolishly took advantage of loans which might be obtained from the Federal Farm Loan Bank at Louisville and gave mortgages on his farms and then loaned the money at a higher rate of interest on other farms. Those farms have depreciated in value 50 per cent, and he is not in a position to repay the Federal Farm Loan Bank at Louisville. Because of that he can not pay. But if you could give that man another year or two and let the Federal Farm Loan Bank of Louisville know they are backed to the extent of \$5,000,000 more money so that they will not be pressed and can exercise judgment, that man will be able to repay his loans.

Furthermore, this \$5,000,000 would enable a Federal farm loan bank to make additional loans to the extent of \$5,000,000 on securities that never would be disputed, and they would increase their earnings to that extent.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Does the gentleman think they should make a loan to a man like that, who borrows money at a low rate of interest from the farm loan banks and loans it out at a usurious rate? His act was contrary to law. That man ought to be made to pay his obligations.

Mr. DUNBAR. Not under the circumstances. The Federal Government permitted the loans and he did not loan at a usurious rate. I think under the circumstances in this case he should be given an opportunity to get on his feet. Not only that man but hundreds of others may be enabled to weather the storm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR] has expired.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I desire your attention a few minutes while I call attention to Report No. 2710, which report accompanies House Joint Resolution 500. This is a joint resolution from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization proposing to suspend 90 per cent of the quota immigration for a period of two years, and to place numerical limitations on the straight-out immigration that may come to the United States for permanent domicile for the two years.

This proposal is the fourth measure put forth by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization during the Seventy-first Congress in an effort to find a way to find a bill that could pass for restriction to meet the present emergency. The fourth bill, the one I am now discussing, eliminates all reference to any effort to control the migration of the people of the Philippines, which our committee

found was one of the stumbling blocks to consideration. We found that a large membership on both sides preferred to have that subject divided. [Applause.]

I note the smile of approval of my good friends, the commissioners from the Philippines, and I may say to them here and now that there is no doubt in my mind that the mere fact that the House committee has stricken the Philippine exclusion paragraph from the bill will do as much as any other one thing to keep the subject alive, and I presume the gentlemen from the Philippines will be gratified because the immigration question will be the entering wedge that will cause consideration in both branches of the question of the independence of the Philippine people. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that while the committee has reported out a bill eliminating the Philippine feature at the same time your committee has reported out a separate bill providing for placing a quota against Philippine immigration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the gentleman's committee going to insist upon action upon both bills at this session of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is not an easy question to answer, because of the responsibilities of any chairman with regard to the will of his committeemen, as expressed by their votes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not a difficult question. It is a fair question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps the gentleman has heard the story of the business meeting of the members of a church, where the minister made a tremendous appeal that the congregation forgive and forget certain charges. Then the ballot was cast and there was a black ball. The minister had to make a still stronger appeal for forgiveness and forgetfulness, and finally one old maid in the congregation, perhaps 60 years old, rose to her feet and said, "I have belonged to this congregation for nigh onto 40 years and in all that time it has been one round of forgive and forget, and I am getting tired of it." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now the application of the story is this: There is never a time that this committee does not have a hundred or more bills on its calendar, and many of them active and under consideration. We get numerous of these out on the House Calendar and then by the persuasive power of the Members and others interested, including those who consistently oppose restriction, oppose deportation, and oppose registration, many of these little "forgiving" bills like helping out Chinese wives, fixing the citizenship of the Virgin Islanders, and so forth, get by and are passed. But when it comes to one of these big bills that is a difficult bill with teeth in it, then there is trouble. The alarm is sounded, and there is so much fear that the measure will offend some one or hurt the sensibilities of aliens in this country, that the House seems to become literally charged with emotion and fear of battle.

The gentleman from Alabama is a member of the powerful Rules Committee and he knows as well as I do, that if I do not propose to weaken in my duties as chairman, that I must advocate every piece of legislation that comes from our committee unless I file minority views. He knows also that between now and adjournment the time is so limited that if I make a positive stand for, first, earnest consideration of this temporary suspension bill; and, second, a strong stand for recognition for suspension of the rules for the enlargement of the deportation clauses of the act of 1920 so as to reach some of the great convicted alien criminals who have not been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, but who are a danger and a menace; and, third, recognition for consideration of a short, sharp bill of four lines describing an international alien communist as inelig-

ble for admission, and deportation if found, I know the distinguished gentleman from Alabama will help, and I think he will agree that nonprivileged Immigration Committee will have done a lot of good work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. WASON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There are several other bills from our committee and but for the fact that some of them have priority views filed against them they might have a chance through unanimous consent. Now, in further answer permit me to say I have served here for 18 years. I have worked in nine of these short sessions. I know from action that it is almost impossible to spur most of the committees except the Appropriations Committee into action or produce committee quorums much before January 5 or 10. Then it takes at least a month to bring hard-fought, intricate, technical bills to the House Calendars before about February 15 or 20. Then comes the great scramble for rules, for recognition by the Speaker, for suspension of rules, and so on. Every chairman urges the bills of his committee considered at once, by any or all methods, willy-nilly, hard scramble, knockdown and drag out, or any other way. I marvel that the Rules Committee and the Speaker of this Congress, or any preceding Congress since I came here in 1913, have done as well as they have to keep orderly procedure in the last 20 days of the short session, particularly since another legislative body is famous for letting important matters pile up. [Applause.] It takes the earnest, orderly efforts of all of us to keep our legislative body going in order, separating the wheat from the chaff, and in all my service I have not seen as many as 10 Members who have carried their feelings over the defeat of one measure, or the failure to secure its consideration, over into revenge or spiteful action against any other bill.

Now, I do not propose dilatory tactics, and I took the floor this afternoon for the express purpose of asking the Members to secure and read carefully Report 2710 on House Joint Resolution 500, a resolution by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. Read that part of the report with regard to border crossing from Canada and Mexico, and the statements that great movements of thousands daily back and forth over these borders—thousands daily—will not be disturbed. I am sorry to say that the thousand copies in the document room this morning are about all gone, but another supply will be ready in the morning.

Please note the fact that the limitations on these contiguous territories indicate small figures, about 6,400 per annum for Canada, does not mean at all that this limitation affects the people coming from Canada to any great extent, except immigrants for permanent domicile, because the non-immigrants will, if this bill becomes law, come into these United States from Canada and Mexico just as they have always done, subject only to the other laws as to health and matters of that kind. All of the crossings at the borders will go on each and every day as it does now. Read the report and you will see there that one situation was created by a sort of "fiction." That may have been necessary in 1928 on account of the difficulty in connection with daily border crossings to the United States of workers. The "fiction" was agreed to in the departments and was held to be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will try to explain the border-crossing situation. The fiction was this: In 1927, after the quota law had been in effect three years, there was a great deal of trouble about people coming in from Canada to work in the United States and going back each night. As a matter of diplomatic exchange it was finally agreed that a person working here on this side and sleeping over there on that side should be considered as being domiciled

in the United States. That seemed to help that problem. But what happened? After we had that fixed through a sort of gentlemen's agreement, then it became necessary to accord to all those with that status exactly the same treatment accorded by the law and the regulation as every other alien; that is to say, the right to leave the United States for a temporary visit of six months and to return without paying additional head tax and securing a visa.

That did not seem to cause great trouble until the unemployment situation came on in the United States with a rush and to a very considerable degree. The right of the alien who had paid the head tax and secured the visa to return within six months is the question. As I said, a bargain was made. The remaining number of beneficiaries will be reduced to zero within a few months. This bill, if enacted, does not go into effect until July 1.

Both departments agree that no saving clause is needed in this piece of legislation to carry out the bargain. That has been made in the name of this Government, and it should be kept. Every man who has paid his head tax, who is in or out of the United States, and who in the past has been given a status will have his full six months in which to return. This is a right given under an Executive order now in existence. It is a fair proposition, and the above arrangements made will not be disturbed. I feel certain about this, and there is not a Member from any of the northern line of States who, when he understands it, need be afraid of this bill for one moment. If I can secure a method for bringing it up on the floor, I feel sure it will pass by 65 to 75 per cent of all the membership. But the majority of our committee needs the active help of just as many of you as possible to get this legislation up. Most of you spoke for it in the elections last fall. It is indorsed by the Secretary of State and Labor. It is for the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTGAU].

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to discuss briefly a serious situation in the agricultural industry at the present time. Most of the Members of the House are undoubtedly familiar with the fact that farm prices are now lower than at any time since 1912. This is due in large part to the fact that six and a half million farmers of the country can produce more food than this Nation can consume. Just recently a situation developed in the dairy industry which makes that a very unprofitable enterprise. During the last two years the dairy industry has been expanded by an increase of 6½ per cent in dairy cows. Last fall the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by a ruling permitted the use of palm oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine, thereby obtaining a yellow color for that product without subjecting it to a 10 cents a pound tax. The dairy industry, already weakened by expansion, was hit a severe blow by that ruling. Unless something is done that ruling will completely nullify any legislation enacted in the interest of the dairy farmer during the last 10 years. It completely nullifies the tariff on butter and any benefits that may be derived from the marketing system set up under the agricultural marketing act. It puts agriculture away back where it was in pre-war days as far as prices on dairy products are concerned.

I am confident that if a rule is permitted for the consideration of the Brigham bill, which places a tax of 10 cents a pound on all colored oleomargarine, and the same becomes a law it will have a very beneficial effect upon the prices of all farm products. It will make it possible for those farmers who have gotten away from the production of surplus crops and have gone into the dairy industry with the hope of improving their conditions to at least save their investments.

I do not know how many members of the Rules Committee ever milked a cow. If they realized how difficult it is to extract butterfat from a cow, or the risk a man undergoes

if the cow is a little bit temperamental, I am quite confident the Rules Committee would give us a rule to permit the membership of this House to vote on the Brigham bill to place a tax on yellow-colored oleo, which is so seriously competing with the products of the dairy industry at the present time. We have a farm in the State of Minnesota and I invite the members of the Rules Committee of the House to spend a week on our farm and attempt to milk the cows there twice a day, and then determine in their own minds whether they would want any man to continue at that occupation with butterfat at about 30 cents a pound.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Yes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. What, if any, provision is made in the Brigham bill in the way of protecting the dairy industry from uncolored oleomargarine? During the year 1930 the packers of this country put into the retail market and sold 255,000,000 pounds of uncolored oleomargarine, which displaced that many pounds of pure butter. What, if any, provision is in the bill to protect the industry from the real competition?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I do not understand that the real competition is from the uncolored oleo. Of course, there is competition, but the manufacturer of yellow-colored oleo or butter-colored oleo is the one whose product is replacing butter at the present time, and I do not know of any legislation that could be enacted that would protect them from the colored oleo other than complete prohibition of the manufacture of oleo.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Why not place a revenue tax of 10 cents a pound on uncolored oleomargarine, the same as on colored oleomargarine?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I think we ought to start on the colored oleo first.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. This would afford the real, substantial protection that the dairy industry is absolutely needing at the present time.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I would support that kind of a measure, I will say to the gentleman, if that was found to be the only way to solve the problem.

Mr. PEAHEY. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PEAHEY. Can the gentleman give the Members of the House who are interested any information as to whether or not a rule is going to be granted and whether the Brigham bill will be brought before the House before the close of this session?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I wish I could give the gentleman from Wisconsin some information along that line. I am sure the people all over the country would be interested in knowing the situation. I am very hopeful about it, and I hope that when we do consider it, it will be in time for another body to act upon the legislation so that it can become law. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, a week or two ago we had some discussion on the floor here about the employment of undercover agents by the Department of Justice. At that time I took exception to some of the remarks made, and I spoke in defense of the man who was the warden at the Atlanta Penitentiary. I communicated with him and I have a letter from him which I will read to you. I know you are interested in the orderly course of justice, and especially I know the lawyers in this House who believe the laws should be enforced in a proper and orderly way, will be interested in the contents of this letter. It is as follows:

SEA BREEZE BEACH CLUB (INC.),
New York, February 14, 1931.

Hon. JOHN J. BOYLAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I thank you for your kind remarks in reply to Congressman LaGuardia, as contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1931.

The practice under Mrs. Willebrandt was to cause agents to be convicted of fictitious crimes in the Federal courts and com-

mitted by Federal judges to Federal penal institutions. Such as, when Peter Hanson, afterwards known as convict No. 26206, Atlanta Penitentiary, was committed by Arthur J. Tuttle, district judge, in Detroit, the commitment being certified under seal of the court. As a matter of fact, Peter Hanson was none other than William Larson, agent of the Department of Justice. He was assigned by Mrs. Willebrandt as a spy to secure evidence with reference to prohibition, income tax, and Federal prisons.

If it were true that it was the policy of the Attorney General to from time to time, with the knowledge and consent of wardens of penal institutions, commit agents, it certainly would not have been necessary to go through to the point of securing an indictment against the agent by a Federal grand jury for a crime which the agent did not commit and then either have the agent plead guilty or convicted and regularly sentenced by a Federal judge.

After the agent, Larson, under the name of Hanson, was committed to Atlanta and remained there from January 6 to April 10, he was suddenly transferred by order of Mrs. Willebrandt from Atlanta to Leavenworth on April 10, 1928, and then again on order of Mrs. Willebrandt he was released by Warden White on April 19, 1928. In other words, Mrs. Willebrandt arrogated to herself the judicial and presidential powers, in that at her will she caused the commitment of men to prison and at her order she ordered their release, disregarding the well-defined rules and principles governing parole and release. Her espionage system was nationally extended.

The records at McNeil Island Penitentiary show that on August 6, 1926, she extracted from said penitentiary one Raleigh Faulkner, convict No. 5778, for use as a spy on free citizens. Faulkner had served less than three months of a 2-year sentence for conspiracy to violate the prohibition act, and he emerged by virtue of a telegram signed by Mrs. Willebrandt dated August 3, 1926. When Faulkner was released the warden at McNeil received a receipt from an agent of the Internal Revenue Service upon which was the following indorsement—

"Released to the custody of the undersigned for two weeks for the purpose of aiding in investigation of the United States Revenue Service under authority of telegram dated at San Francisco, August 23, 1926."

Signed by Mrs. Willebrandt, Assistant Attorney General. However, while Faulkner was borrowed from the penitentiary, ostensibly for two weeks, he was out on spy duty from August 6 to November 24, on which day he was delivered into my custody at Atlanta by John A. Conwell, of the Intelligence Unit of the Treasury Department.

It is interesting to note the history of this man who was selected by Mrs. Willebrandt as a Federal investigator:

1910. One year, county jail, Seattle. Name of crime not given.

1912. As Raleigh M. Faulkner, United States prison, McNeil Island, three years, counterfeiting, convict No. 2185.

1916. Eight months, Pierce County jail, Tacoma, Wash., smuggling.

1917. As A. M. Falconer, Seattle, convict No. 13929; disposition not given.

1918. Pierce County jail, 12 months and fined \$6,000.

1920. As Raleigh Faulkner, United States prison, McNeil Island, liquor conspiracy, 15 months, convict No. 5454.

What reliance or credence would anybody put on or in the investigations conducted by such a person? Particularly when a reward of commutation is held out, as is evidenced in the case of a convict, Lloyd L. Miller, registered No. 22968, who was transferred to Atlanta from Leavenworth on September 12, 1926.

On November 7, 1926, Miller wrote a letter to Attorney General Sargent, containing the following:

"On September 12 I was transferred here from Leavenworth Prison because of the investigations staged on Warden Biddle and other officials. There I was a head electrician, and was alone over a department controlling also the outside phone systems, and from this department I operated an electric dictaphone on the warden for more than eight months, also the late Doctor Yohe and the deputy warden. Therefore, I know practically everything that is contained in the records of the investigation, a large part of which I provided, including correspondence to Senators and Congressmen and from them."

It is apparent that in sending this letter to the Attorney General Miller wanted his reward "for services rendered" in spying upon Warden Biddle. This was one of a series of undercover operations which for one whole year had been in full blast at Leavenworth under orders of Mrs. Willebrandt, which were executed by Thomas C. Wilcox, her agent, in the Bureau of Investigations, who was recently dismissed by the mayor of Detroit, Murphy, as police commissioner.

In that investigation, made by the same man, Thomas C. Wilcox, only the dregs of the penitentiary were interviewed—perverts, morons, confirmed criminals who had lost good time for violation of prison rules, fabricated stories under promise of commutation, parole, or restoration of lost good time. These stories as fabricated were transmitted by Agent Wilcox to John Edgar Hoover and in turn were passed on to Mrs. Willebrandt, and are the things to which Congressman LaGuardia refers. However, at no time has anyone ever dared to make a written charge against Biddle, the former warden of Leavenworth, or against me. That vicious probe, however, forced Warden Biddle, a trustworthy officer, into the necessity of a resignation from the service almost parallel to my own.

Miller was subsequently commuted. Even after Mrs. Willebrandt's spy system was exposed by the Atlanta Constitution, she received no official rebuke from any source, and, utterly disregard-

ing the congressional committee's report and defying both press and public, she caused another fraudulent commitment.

On the 21st day of February, 1929, with seeming regularity, I admitted at Atlanta Penitentiary a convict named Joseph Montana, alias John Mason, true name, as it later developed, Fred J. Lackey, and actually a Department of Justice agent. Montana had undergone incarceration but 13 days' service of his 3-year sentence when, with the same suddenness as in the Hanson case, I was visited at the prison on March 6, 1929, by Thomas C. Wilcox, armed with an order from Mrs. Willebrandt directing me to release to Wilcox, F. J. Lackey, special agent, who, as Joseph Montana, was incarcerated in Atlanta Penitentiary. While reading her order I received a telegram, as follows:

JOHN W. SNOOK, Warden.

Release Joseph Montana, who is special agent this department, to T. C. Wilcox, special agent in charge Bureau of Investigation.

MITCHELL.

I telephoned A. H. Conner, Superintendent of Federal Prisons, and he informed me that he was totally ignorant of the incarceration of Montana or the order for his release, but that I had best comply with it. Thereupon I delivered Montana to Wilcox, who promptly released him.

In order that the judge might be advised, presuming he had been an innocent party in the conspiracy to incarcerate a Government agent as an actual convict by falsification of official documents, I wrote Judge Hough as follows:

HON. BENSON W. HOUGH,

United States District Judge, Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: On February 21, 1929, Joseph Montana, alias John Mason, whose prison number is No. 29023, was received at this penitentiary under sentence of three years for violation of the national motor vehicle act. The commitment bears the signature of Harry F. Rabe, clerk of the District Court of the United States, Southern District of Ohio, and the seal of the United States district court is affixed thereto, certifying that the sentence was imposed by your honor on February 20, 1929.

On March 6, 1929, by order of Attorney General Mitchell, Mabel Walker Willebrandt, Assistant Attorney General, together with telephone instructions by A. H. Conner, superintendent of Federal prisons, I delivered Joseph Montana, No. 29023, into the custody of Thomas C. Wilcox, special agent of the Department of Justice. My information is that immediately upon the departure from the penitentiary Mr. Wilcox released Montana and he is now at liberty.

I am calling this matter to your attention as the judge who imposed the sentence, as I am not aware of any law authorizing the Department of Justice to liberate a convict whose sentence has been put into operation except by Executive clemency, parole, expiration of sentence, or order of a court superior to the one at which sentence was imposed.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. SNOOK, Warden.

To which I received the following reply:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 29, 1929.

HON. JOHN W. SNOOK,

Warden United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR SIR: Upon my return to Columbus, after an absence of a couple of weeks, I find your letter of March 18.

I remember the disposition of the Montana case to which you allude. It was disposed of as one of the cases on the criminal schedule at Cincinnati, during the month of February, when I was handling the business at that station. The defendant was brought into court for arraignment, having been charged with violation of the national motor vehicle theft act. Upon being arraigned, he entered a plea of guilty and was sentenced to the penitentiary for a period of three years. Subsequent to this time, I have heard nothing in reference to his case, but assumed that a commitment was issued and the defendant conveyed to the penitentiary.

I believe that the statement of the legal rules applicable is the correct statement as appears in the last paragraph of your letter. I shall make further inquiries in the premises.

Respectfully,

BENSON W. HOUGH,
United States District Judge.

Judge Hough, on June 3, 1929, according to the Chicago Tribune, stated:

"That it was at the request of United States Judge Smith Hickenlooper, of the circuit court of appeals, that he consented to sentence Lackey for a crime that had not in fact been committed. Judge Hickenlooper had just been promoted to the court of appeals, and therefore was unable to favor Mrs. Willebrandt himself. Judge Hickenlooper refused to answer any questions regarding the matter, saying it was none of the business of the press or public."

It would be interesting indeed to call the Federal judges who made these commitments to state whether or not they knew that the commitments were fictitious and that they permitted the seal of the court to countenance a fraud.

The official records of the Atlanta Penitentiary during the time I was warden speak for themselves. In justice to me, LaGUARDIA should produce any records he has on which he bases his remarks.

At no time was a report submitted to me of any spy or undercover agent while I was at Atlanta. By experience and training I

was qualified for the position I held, and I believe that the institution of a spy system is un-American, destructive of the morale of the prisoners, and an encouragement to the depraved and vicious to besmear and besmirch and lie so as to secure commutation or other personal reward. No court should lend itself to a false commitment, and the Department of Justice, above all, should keep its hands clean. No result justifies dishonorable and vicious means to acquire same.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNOOK.

During the reading of the letter the following colloquy occurred:

MR. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. BOYLAN. I yield.

MR. GARBER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman say that is a true statement of facts?

MR. BOYLAN. Yes.

MR. GARBER of Oklahoma. The gentleman vouches for the statement that Mrs. Willebrandt, acting as Assistant Attorney General, had a person enter a plea of guilty, and the United States district judge sentenced that person to the penitentiary, that person not having committed the crime and no evidence was produced that he had violated the law?

MR. BOYLAN. I do not know about the evidence, but I know that that was the course of proceeding, and the man was committed to the penitentiary.

MR. GARBER of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman regard that as a most dishonorable and despicable proceeding?

MR. BOYLAN. I certainly think it is; and that is why I am reading this letter to the House.

MR. GARBER of Oklahoma. I think it has done more harm and brought more disrepute into the enforcement of the law than have those who violated the law. [Applause.]

MR. BOYLAN. I believe with the gentleman, and that is why I am giving the House the information I have.

MR. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER].

MR. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish your permission to speak a few words of a personal character, a few words in personal tribute to our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

This, as you know, is the last appropriation bill for the session. I have had the honor to serve on this committee during the eight years I have been in this body, and throughout that service I have been struck with the fine spirit of harmony and unanimity of purpose of the committee's membership.

I can recall no instance in my service where any question before the Appropriations Committee was determined through partisan considerations. I think it is fortunate that in a committee of this character, whose members constitute, in a measure, the shock troops of the House, because of the responsibility imposed—I say I consider it to be most fortunate that the committee has been able to operate in that spirit.

During the first portion of my service the distinguished chairman of the committee was the late and greatly lamented Martin B. Madden, one of the most efficient chairmen of that committee we have ever had. I think I can say in all truth and sincerity—and I believe I voice the sentiment of the committee—regardless of party considerations, when I declare that our present chairman, WILL R. WOOD, is a worthy successor of the late Chairman Madden. [Applause.]

He has discharged, in a splendidly effective manner, the burdens and duties imposed upon him by the chairmanship. He has been able to do this, not only because of his efficiency, his great knowledge of legislative matters, State and National, but because, also, of his zeal and courage. Certainly no finer quality can distinguish any legislator than that of courage; and that quality our distinguished chairman possesses in eminent degree.

I may suggest in passing, that the cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the ranking member on that committee, has always been of the most efficient and splendid character. It is significant that

the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, representing the majority party in this body, is also the chairman of the congressional committee of his party, and that the ranking member of the committee on the Democratic side, Mr. BYRNS, is also chairman of the Democratic congressional committee. Both these distinguished honors came to these two men not only because of party service, but because also of outstanding public service. Yet neither of them seems to let the left hand know what the right hand doeth; and with peculiar skill, it seems to me, they have been able always to distinguish between party considerations, which have their place outside of the committee, and national considerations, which, alone, should prevail inside of the committee. [Applause.] I am glad to pay these tributes to these distinguished gentlemen.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THATCHER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend from Kentucky in the eloquent tribute which he has paid to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe there is a position in the House or in the Congress which involves so great a responsibility, and I may say so much labor as that of the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations, a committee which has the duty of investigating and recommending to Congress appropriations involving billions of dollars every year. I join my friend in what he has said with reference to the fairness, the ability, the earnestness, and the courage of our distinguished friend, the present chairman of that committee. Having served with him on two of its important subcommittees during the past several years, in fact, ever since he has been chairman, I know something of the prodigious labor that he has performed, and particularly during this session, and I know something of his very great and intelligent and courageous efforts to hold down these immense appropriations in the interest of the taxpayers generally. [Applause.]

Mr. THATCHER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He has said what I wished to say much better than I could say it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, at the end of each session the last word is had by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. It is fulsome with praise of the administration and lavish with mist over its shortcomings. Usually the job is a difficult one, but TILSON is always equal to the task. To give the Republican valedictory this year would need the brains of an Einstein, the wizardry of a Houdini, and the tones of Rudy Vallee, but TILSON will do the trick.

However, history is entitled to a true version of this session, so here goes: The outstanding accomplishment of the administration was a successful assault on Webster's Dictionary. Hoover won the White House when radio was given the verdict over raddio, but the raddio will turn. Naturally he began to play with words. Disdaining the short and ugly word "food" as having no place in American sociology, but of vast importance in Russian, Italian, and Belgian life, he struck "food" from Webster's, and, with the aid of Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, of the Department of Agriculture, he substituted "rehabilitation." This was not done excepting at the cost of a great amount of human misery, political and otherwise.

The White House and the Capitol had at each other in a terrible fury, the one shouting its slogan, "No dole," and the other crying, "Food for the love of Allah, food." Hoover would make mad faces at Congress, and then send Walter Newton over to say he didn't mean it. Finally the relievers went into a huddle and came out with "rehabilitation." In the meanwhile the humanitarian allowed the children to watch the pigs eat. Hoover compromised everything—the country, Congress, his party, and himself.

Hoover brought about another lexicographical change. The word "panic" grated on his ears, so he had the Cabinet members, including the greatest Secretary of the Treasury

since Andrew Mellon, recite in sympathetic unison five hundred times a day the word "prosperity." They were going around the streets with their tongues hanging out crying "Prosperity." For a while the people thought that the seat of government was at St. Elizabeths Hospital. Finally to the mind of the engineering genius there came a light, and thereafter, lo and behold, the word "panic" was to be known as "depression," and the word "prosperity" was to be known as "depression," or vice versa. As Lincoln split rails, Hoover split hairs.

Early the good people were surprised to learn that the word "limited" in the language of the engineer when applied to tariff revision meant "unlimited." Mr. Grundy was the crossword puzzle artist who added the "un" for the occasion. Hoover was always careless about words, getting Democratic and Republican, English and American all mixed up.

Of the engineer the folks expected miracles, and we found that the age of miracles had not passed. A group of weather-beaten little travelers, headed by Rip Van Wickersham, sought shelter in the White House from the storms without. They creaked and groaned pitifully, "Master, we are wet." Hoover drew himself proudly to his full height, and, a la Mussolini, waved his arm over them, saying, "Brethren, thou art dry." Dry they became as dust, and blew away, nevermore to be seen by mortal man.

The chief fell down, though, on one miracle. Congress on the bonus gave him a Bronx cheer when he tried to make us believe that Andrew Mellon was Alexander Hamilton. Even the Angel Gabriel TREADWAY nearly choked when he announced this funny reincarnation.

This, my comrades—with apologies to HAM FISH—in brief, is the to date and unexpurgated history of the engineer. As the Harding administration gave America the era of "official dishonesty," Hoover has given us the age of "intellectual dishonesty." So be it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE].

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of Congress and the country to the results of two experiments in State ownership and operation of cement plants, which are now matters of public record and from which, I feel sure, the advocates of more Government in business can take little comfort.

In presenting these conclusions I speak as one of the Representatives of the largest cement-producing districts in the country, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania.

My interest in this question was aroused because almost every winter when State legislative bodies convene, political agitation appears in some section of the country or other for a publicly owned cement plant.

Often my colleagues in Congress coming from States where such agitation has become pronounced have asked me for information as to the history and economic value of publicly owned cement plants, and until recently I have been able to give them only a general answer. However, for some time past I have been collecting data on this subject, and, after a serious study of this material with the assistance of several trained and responsible accountants, I now submit the results of that study, which I believe to be a complete, impartial, and accurate one.

There are at present two State-owned cement plants in operation in the United States—one at Chelsea, Mich., and another at Rapid City, S. Dak.

The Michigan plant is manned by convict labor. It was leased by the State in 1923. The lease provided for purchase by the State in five years or less and under this provision Michigan became owner of the plant in 1925 at a cost of \$500,000 plus inventory of stock and certain minor additions.

Since State operation started the plant has been a center of controversy and dissension—political and otherwise. It has been variously characterized as "a political football," "a boon to the State," "a white elephant"; and these con-

flicting opinions forced their way into every political campaign. The quality of cement has been criticized and defended, the price at times has been held excessive and higher than that charged by private manufacturers, the cost of manufacture has been condemned as exorbitant, and the convict-labor principle has been condemned in a continuous barrage of charges and countercharges which have clouded the real facts at issue.

But there is now little necessity for becoming involved in controversy or figures concerning the Michigan plant. Responsible State officials concede its failure and are casting about for some method of disposing of it. Last year State Treasurer Frank McKay submitted to the State administrative board a recommendation that the plant be sold, since the records of his office showed that on July 1, 1930, the plant was \$742,295 "in the red."

Governor Green, who was then in office, summed up the situation in a statement appearing in the Detroit Free Press of July 1, 1930, in which he said:

The plant cost \$500,000 and another \$200,000 has been spent. The cost was to have been met by the plant's profits, but there has been nothing but an annual deficit since.

A more recent editorial in the same newspaper, under the date of January 17, 1931, seems to express the sound opinion of the State. This editorial concludes with the following language:

The plant has been a hundred per cent liability from the beginning and has cost the taxpayers a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is not so very many months since Governor Green admitted that the Chelsea cement plant constituted one of the real puzzles of his administration which he has been unable to solve. The legislature is in a different position. It has the power, at least, to junk the shebang, write it off as profit and loss, and so prevent further drain.

The South Dakota experiment is not so unquestionably a failure. Certain of its sponsors and—fairness compels me to admit—many of the citizens of the State still cling to it as of some value. In certain official quarters it is stated that the South Dakota plant has not lost money but, unless the best auditing advice I can secure is inaccurate, this plant has cost the State upwards of \$400,000 in losses.

Before presenting the figures which prove this serious loss a word about the history of the plant seems pertinent. It had its genesis in the Non-Partisan League movement in South Dakota. In 1917 the State legislature authorized the submission to the voters of an amendment to the constitution establishing a State-owned plant. This amendment was carried by a popular vote and a cement commission was appointed and allotted \$25,000 to explore materials and investigate sites. A bond issue of \$1,000,000 for building and operating the plant was authorized and this issue was later increased to \$2,000,000. Construction was begun at Rapid City in 1923 and the plant was in partial production in 1924. In 1925 an additional \$275,000 was appropriated to put the plant in operation.

According to the profit and loss statement issued by the South Dakota State Cement Commission for the period ending June 30, 1930, the plant has earned \$668,684.40 since January 1, 1925. Obviously the discrepancy between this claim of substantial profit and my figures deduced from the same official statement showing a loss of \$411,977.89 must be accounted for by different methods of bookkeeping and by failure to make depreciation allowances and other charges approved by modern accounting practice and which are recognized as important factors in appraising the success or failure of any carefully regulated industrial enterprise.

The following table contains a complete schedule of earnings by years from January 1, 1925, to June 30, 1930, with proper deductions made for losses not contained in the balance sheets or the profit and loss statements. These deductions include interest on bonds, insufficient depreciation and loss of taxes—all of which items are fundamental in determining the financial and economic status of a going concern—whether its ownership be private or public.

These are the figures:

South Dakota State cement plant—Statement of losses not contained in balance sheet or semiannual profit and loss statements

Year	Profits shown by State	Insufficient depreciation ¹	Interest on bonds	Taxes	Loss to State
1925.....	\$78,046.55	\$5,390.50	\$102,700.00	\$40,500.00	\$59,762.95
1926.....	107,888.63	6,075.26	102,700.00	40,538.24	29,274.35
1927.....	63,163.70	25,351.59	102,700.00	39,280.07	104,167.96
1928.....	142,077.65	33,304.66	102,700.00	38,937.71	32,864.72
1929.....	186,947.60	49,771.79	102,700.00	36,104.34	1,628.53
1930 to June 30.....	90,560.07	24,141.49	51,350.00	16,947.96	1,879.38
Total.....	668,684.20	121,103.77	564,850.00	212,308.32	229,577.89

¹ Calculated on basis of 5 per cent annually against depreciated fixed assets. This method of calculating depreciation has been approved for the cement industry by the U. S. Treasury Department.

² Estimated.

In addition to the loss shown above the State has lost the interest on bonds from date of issue to beginning of 1925, the first year of operation.

Loss to State.....\$229,577.89

This interest amounts to:

\$270,000 for 3 years 3 months, at 6 per cent.....\$52,650.00
\$1,730,000 for 1 year 6 months, at 5 per cent.....129,750.00

182,400.00

Total loss.....411,977.89

By some curious bookkeeping a profit of \$90,560.07 was claimed for the first six months of 1930, when a glance at the above table will show an actual loss of \$1,879.38 when the accepted practices of industrial accounting are followed.

The financial record of the South Dakota plant stamps as questionable, at least, the business acumen and foresight of the commission first appointed to explore the possibilities of a State-owned plant. Included in the findings of this commission was the following prophetic utterance:

That with the prospective demand and use of cement in South Dakota within the next five years we are of the opinion that a cement plant located at Rapid City would save the people of the State twice the cost of building the plant.

It would be the part of charity, perhaps, to dwell no longer on the evaporation of this prophecy and to let the prophets explain how the vision of a \$2,000,000 profit transformed itself into the reality of a \$411,000 loss.

In addition to these losses there are other items of expense to be considered which are not entered in the official report of the South Dakota Cement Commission, notably the salaries of State employees whose chief duty is concerned with the production of cement but whose names are carried on other pay rolls.

If a further example of the difficulty in successfully administering a publicly owned cement plant is necessary, I might point to the experience of Los Angeles, which, in 1909, began operation of a municipal plant to provide cement for an aqueduct.

After some years of operation this plant, which cost \$890,000, was sold for \$450,000, and in the meantime it is estimated that the city paid \$1.31 per barrel more than the price at which it could have purchased cement from private manufacturers.

I wish to emphasize the fact that the cement manufactured at the South Dakota plant is sold at the market price except in unusual cases. It is sold, moreover, not only in South Dakota but its sale is pressed in adjoining States. This latter imposition involves a phase of Government encroachment which has dangerous ramifications and which has been violently condemned by sound economists, but it is beyond the scope of my discussion to-day.

I do not desire to intrude myself into the increasingly bitter controversy over public versus private ownership, but, in all good faith, I would advise State governments that if they elect to intrude themselves into private enterprises they avoid the cement business, which stands to-day with an idle capacity of 100,000,000 barrels.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose to speak with reference to this bill. This is the last appropriation bill of a general character that we will have to do with during this session of the

Congress. I congratulate each and every member of this Committee of the Whole upon the signal help that they have given in passing all the appropriation bills heretofore and for their cooperation in the speedy passage of this one. We want to get this bill over to the other end of the Capitol as quickly as possible so that there can be no blame whatever attached here for an extra session of Congress. Also, I extend my sincere thanks for the splendid cooperation that I have received from first to last from the members of the Committee on Appropriations. As stated heretofore, there is no politics in the Committee on Appropriations, and only on one or two occasions, and those years ago, have I ever seen in the deliberations of that committee an attempt at playing politics.

I would be remiss if I did not take advantage of this opportunity also to express my profound regard and sincere appreciation to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. [Applause.] He has been helpful always, never obstructing for a single moment. He has given the best of his time, of his intellect, of the experience that he has acquired by years of service to this committee. I feel that I could go away to-night with the appropriation bills yet before me and feel content in knowing that the responsibilities were in the hands of JOSEPH BYRNS.

I know that my interest and the interest of the country, the interest of Congress and of all concerned would be faithfully conserved. [Applause.] At no time has Mr. BYRNS ever shown the slightest disposition by reason of his political affiliation to take advantage of the exalted position that he holds on this committee. I take pleasure in paying him this tribute.

The Clerk may read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Those members of the Committee on Appropriations, Seventy-first Congress, third session, comprising the subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Department appropriations, who are Members elect to the Seventy-second Congress, or a majority of them, during the period from March 4, 1931, and until the convening of the first regular session of the Seventy-second Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, concerning the foreign and domestic air mail and ocean mail work of the Post Office Department and the estimates and appropriations for such purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read.

I wish to say in preface that I do not object to members of the Committee on Appropriations going about the country making investigations as to matters pertaining to the work that comes under their purview, but as this section is drafted it would permit the subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments to take a junket to Europe under the guise of investigating air mail and ocean mail contracts. I do not think it is the intentment of the restrictive Committee on Appropriations to have language so broad that even the subcommittee could take a nice ride across the ocean under the guise of investigating foreign and domestic air mail contracts. If it is, I would like to have a frank expression from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WOOD. There is no idea upon the part of the chairman of this committee to take any junket of that character, and I think I can safely say with reference to the other members of the subcommittee that that was the farthest thing from their minds when this item was placed in the bill. It may be that by reason of want of knowledge on the part of every Member of this House as to the ramifications of these air mail contracts and some of the ocean contracts an inquiry should be made into the manner in which the contracts are made, into the working of them, into the schedules that have been adopted, and a thousand other things that perhaps should be explained, or the committee given possession of the facts so that they could explain the matters to the House. The only purpose of this item is that possibly during the vacation, if in the judgment of the committee they think it well, we might make this investigation with

reference to the particular items mentioned. As far as I know, all the facts necessary to be ascertained could be ascertained in the city of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I prefaced my remarks, I have no objection to investigation being made, but I did have objection to the broad language which would permit a committee to travel abroad, under the guise of making this investigation. If it is not the purpose of the gentleman's subcommittee to go abroad, would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment after the word "elsewhere," "in continental United States"?

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was entirely fair in his reference to the subcommittee and his intimation that it proposed to take a trip abroad under the guise of making an investigation; I do not think that was just to the members of the committee. I do not think it should have come from the gentleman from Wisconsin, who I am sure always wishes to be fair. I regret that for the first time the gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be making an objection of this kind. There have been other resolutions passed, and there is in appropriation bills that have been passed already the same authority, and I dare say the gentleman made no such unfair insinuation. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] said, there is no intention on the part of the subcommittee to take a junket trip anywhere. This subcommittee, of which I have been a member for years and years, has never taken a trip and has never sought authority to make one; but permit me to show you the situation. The Post Office Department appropriation bill carries something like \$37,000,000 for ship mail subsidy and \$20,000,000 for air mail subsidy, and your committee is compelled to sit in a committee room, in the space of an hour or two of ex parte hearings and hear one man or hear one department tell us what is being done and what is required, without an opportunity to investigate the matter through other sources; without an opportunity to investigate the shipping companies or the air mail companies and to know something about what we are asked to recommend to Congress.

I, for one, have made up my mind that so far as I am concerned I am not going to assume the responsibility, as one member of that subcommittee, of recommending some \$60,000,000 this year and perhaps seventy or seventy-five million dollars next year without having an opportunity to know something about it. That is all I ask. Certainly I think it would justify this Congress, and it would justify the Government in giving that committee, which is expected to go into these details and recommend to you what it thinks you should do, an opportunity to get the facts in regard to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I prefaced my remarks very explicitly—perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee did not hear them—that I had no objection whatsoever to the Committee on Appropriations making an investigation or having hearings during the recess, as far as this country was concerned; but that I did object, and I do so now, notwithstanding the strictures or attempted strictures leveled against me, to any authority as broad as this, that would authorize a subcommittee or any committee to take a joy ride across the sea under the guise of investigating foreign mail contracts.

I also asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], before the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] took the floor, whether he would have any objection to incorporating after the word "elsewhere" the words "in continental United States." The gentleman from Tennessee took the floor and did not give the chairman of the committee an opportunity to respond.

Mr. WOOD. I may say I do not think there is the remotest possibility of this investigation requiring this committee to go out of the United States, but there might be that possibility; and if this investigation could not be completed without it, the committee would be handicapped in conducting the investigation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not conceive where this investigation would carry the Committee on Appropriations outside continental United States.

Mr. WOOD. We have mail contracts all over South America. We have contracts with contractors in South America. We have all this character of contracts all through continental Europe. I wish to repeat that I do not think there is the remotest chance of our doing that thing, but it might be absolutely necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman from Indiana is not willing to have incorporated some limitation as to where this committee may go, then I must press the point of order. I am willing even to go to the extent of saying "in the United States and its possessions."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order, and I also want to be heard in response to some statements that have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve the point of order, to permit the gentleman from Tennessee to make an explanation.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana.

I do not think it ever occurred to the committee that this would involve any extended trip or anything of that kind. This committee is simply seeking an opportunity to look into these appropriations so as to come to some intelligent conclusion with reference to these mail contracts, upon which we only have ex parte testimony. I am not willing, as one of those who are expected to look into these matters and advise Congress as to whether or not under our hearings we think the money ought to be appropriated, to accept ex parte testimony on appropriations which are growing now and have grown from \$8,000,000, \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 every year and have reached \$60,000,000 up to this time, without having an opportunity, as I say, of looking into the facts. I have the idea—I do not know—that most if not all this information can be secured here. That I do not know, but I do not think there ought to be any limitation placed upon the committee in so far as its work is concerned.

Now, it is only for the purpose, as I say, of getting some information on this subject that we ask to have this item incorporated in the bill. If the gentleman wants to make a reflection upon this committee by his action, that is his privilege, and I shall have nothing to say as to that. But, for one, if this House is not willing to trust this subcommittee with this investigation—and whether it will take place or not I do not know, for it may not be necessary. If we can get the proper facts and information that we want to get before our hearings, such an investigation may not be necessary; but if this House and the Congress are not willing to trust this subcommittee with a matter of this kind, then I would rather see the whole proposition go out. If our investigation can not be made thorough enough and broad enough to get all the facts, then it should not be made. That is the way I feel about it. But I have the idea, Mr. Chairman, that this committee will exercise just as much economy and show just as much interest in the Public Treasury as my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Because I have abiding faith—by reason of long service with the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BYRNS]—that whatever sum is used will not be misspent, because I thought I was doing a public service in trying to limit the appropriation, and having confidence also in the integrity of purpose of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is also the chairman of this subcommittee, and knowing that

he will not abuse the privileges vested under this item, I will not further press the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I approve of the language in this appropriation bill which has caused a member of the Appropriations Committee to severely criticize my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin. The trouble with the House of Representatives is that it does not provide for sufficient investigations, but leaves investigations to be made by a bunch of professional investigators and pay rollers over on the other side of the Capitol. [Applause.]

I want at this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the necessity of liberalizing one provision of the House rules as found on page 305 of the manual, the rule which defines the duties and jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which committee I have the honor to be a member.

The late distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee was one of the strongest advocates favoring the creation of this committee in order that the Congress could have its hand on the expenditure of public funds. Unless this rule is liberalized so that the Committee on Expenditures can properly function, you might as well abolish that committee. In the name of economy and good government I believe the next Congress should liberalize this rule, so as to authorize the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to subpoena witnesses, compel their testimony, and provide for a lump-sum appropriation for expenses, so that this committee can operate. If we had this authority, and even if we would only investigate the expenditures in one or two departments, it would have a wholesome effect and put the rest of the departments on guard.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Capitol Grounds: For additional amount required for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, \$3,800.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wood: Page 3, after line 10, insert the following:

"For the installation of a ventilating system for the rooms of the Committee on Ways and Means, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$5,210."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For an additional amount for the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, including the same objects specified under this head in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$77,000, of which amount not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for transfer to the Commission of Fine Arts for direct expenditure for the preparation and display of and exhibit of fine arts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the chairman of the committee inform the House as to the total amount of appropriation that has been made up to date for the celebration that is to be in charge of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; what has been appropriated, what is carried in this bill and next year's bill makes more than \$700,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. From reading the report, I notice it is the purpose to provide busts different from the kind we formerly had in this country, and also tracts for distribution to various schools and the like. What is the real purpose of this appropriation?

Mr. WOOD. The purpose of this appropriation, as has been stated, is to supply pamphlets and tracts that include a great many historic events, and writings and sayings of George Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in the report that it is stated that \$23,500 is to be spent in connection with agricultural fairs, county fairs, State fairs, and farm organizations, and \$15,000 for the reproduction of busts and photographs.

Mr. WOOD. This is for the purpose of interesting every character of organization in this country in participating in this celebration, including agricultural societies and every character of civic organization, in order that the whole country may in some way participate in the celebration. This is not only for the purpose of celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of George Washington's birth, but the purpose is to take advantage of this opportunity to disseminate information throughout the United States so that this will be a celebration not only in recognition of the life and services of the Father of this country, but to also instill in the minds of the present generation and the generations that are to come, appreciation of what this country means, and also to inspire proper respect for our laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. How are these busts going to be distributed?

Mr. WOOD. Through the administration of this commission. I see that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is present, and perhaps he can tell you.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice the executive head of the commission is present. I have been partly in sympathy with the commission's work, and I would like to know whether we are going into a new project, and what is intended under the \$15,000 appropriation for busts. I was informed the other day that some busts had been received by Members—is it proposed to distribute them to Members of the House and Senate?

Mr. BLOOM. The \$15,000 which has been mentioned is not for busts alone. The \$15,000 is for busts and photographs. The only busts we are going to have at the present time will be distributed to Members of the Senate and Members of the House and to governors of the States.

We are collecting photographs and pictures of Washington from every part of the world. They have never been collected before. It will be one of the most valuable collections for libraries, newspapers, and different institutions of learning throughout the country.

I will say to the gentleman that this is one time when we change the object of the celebration. We are taking the celebration to the people instead of having the people come to the celebration.

I have in my office a list of a few of the institutions that we are taking the celebration to, and if the gentleman will look at it he will see where this celebration is different. I would like to have you look at it and see what we are doing. You can see how we are administering it, and you can see how we are functioning. We are taking the celebration through every postmaster in the United States, and there are 48,910. There are 230,000 churches in the United States which we are dealing with, sending them information regarding the history of our country and the history and the life of Gen. George Washington.

Now, please remember that up to the present time only 40 per cent of the writings of Washington have ever been published. We are publishing nearly 100 per cent in the definitive sets of writings of Washington, of which there will be 25 volumes. In those 25 volumes, the cost of which is a part of the \$700,000 that has been alluded to, they are printing the 25 volumes of the definitive writings of Washington.

Now, do not think that we are spending the money and that nothing is coming back. When we are through with what we are doing and what we are trying to do the celebration will not cost the Government very much.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman how is it coming back?

Mr. BLOOM. One thing we are doing is issuing a set of stamps, and of those stamps we will sell at least a million dollars' worth which will not be used. These stamps will be

from half a cent up to 10 cents and go into larger denominations. We also get practically all of the money that we paid for printing these definitive writings, which will cost \$300,000.

Mr. MICHENER. Where do you get that from?

Mr. BLOOM. From selling the sets. We are printing 3,000 sets—1,000 will be distributed to Members of Congress and 2,000 sets are to be sold for the cost of the 3,000 sets. So that part of the cost of the celebration will naturally come back to the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is, provided that you sell 2,000 sets to purchasers at \$50 a set.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that we are trying to have 6,000 sets printed instead of 3,000 sets.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a bill on the calendar reported from the Committee on the Library whereby they strike out 6,000 and recommend 3,000, 2,000 for sale and 1,000 for free distribution to Members of Congress.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but the committee having this in charge, and representing the greatest publishers in the country and the greatest librarians, recommend 6,000. They went into the matter carefully. We had nothing to do with that. That was recommended by this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, permit me to make this observation for fear there may be some misconception of what the gentleman has said concerning these busts. The gentleman from New York has said that the commission is giving to each Representative and Senator one of these busts. These are not to be the personal property of the Congressmen to take away with them, but they are to be placed in their offices so that when visitors come in there they will see a bust of George Washington. I don't want it to go out to the country that the Members of this House personally are receiving these busts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payable to Sisseton and Wahpeton Indians (tribal funds): The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$270,000 with accrued interest thereon, representing the balance of the amount appropriated to satisfy claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Sioux Indians by the act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 876), and to pay the same per capita to Indians found by him to be entitled thereto, in accordance with the requirements of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793): *Provided*, That shares due or belonging to competent Indians shall be paid in cash, and shares of all other Indians, including minors, shall be deposited to their individual credit and be subject to existing regulations governing individual Indian moneys.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order on the paragraph and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will present the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. Wood: Page 30, line 3, strike out the word "payable" and insert "payment."

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Power plant, Coolidge Dam, San Carlos Reservation (reimbursable): For completing construction of a power plant for development of electrical power at the Coolidge Dam as an incident to the use of the Coolidge Reservoir authorized by the act of Congress approved March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200), and under the terms and conditions of, and reimbursed as provided in, the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475), as supplemented and amended, fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$6,000, together with the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, which are hereby continued available until June 30, 1932.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Page 31, line 13, strike out the word "reimbursed" and insert "reimbursable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Browning school district, Montana: The appropriation of \$15,000 contained in the Interior Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1932, for completing the Blackfeet boarding school, Montana, is hereby made available for reimbursing Browning School District No. 9, Glacier County, Mont., for expenditures made in the extension and betterment of the public high-school building at Browning, Mont., on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, under authorization of the act of May 15, 1930 (46 Stat. 334).

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 33, following line 20, insert:

"Frazer, Mont., School District No. 2: For cooperation with School District No. 2, Frazer, Mont., in construction of a public high-school building at that place, as authorized by public law, 652, Seventy-first Congress, \$25,000.

"Poplar, Mont., School District No. 9: For cooperation with School District No. 9, Poplar, Mont., in extension and betterment of the public high-school building at that place, authorized by public law, 657, Seventy-first Congress, \$50,000."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman to state what the purpose of that amendment is.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, this is to carry out the purposes of the acts which were signed on the 14th of this month, providing for cooperation of school districts on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation and in the construction of two schools that are largely attended by Indian children.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fees and expenses, litigation involving Osage mineral rights, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For attorney fees and all other expenses in connection with litigation involving the validity of acts of Congress relating to ownership of mineral rights in and to lands within the Osage Nation, Oklahoma, as authorized by and in accordance with the act approved January 31, 1931 (Public Act No. 583, 71st Cong.), fiscal years 1931 and 1932, \$100,000, payable from funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Osage Tribe of Indians.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask the attention of the chairman of the committee and of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. A few days ago we passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of not to exceed \$100,000 out of the funds of the Osage Tribe of Indians, to be used in the defense of contemplated suits that may be brought against them. I thought at the time that if we had sufficient discussion on the floor of the House it would insure us that all of this appropriation would not be asked at this time or used. It was my understanding when the authorization bill was passed that only a part of the appropriation would be made, but all of it would be authorized so that contracts could be made. I find now that the entire \$100,000 is authorized to be expended here, and I am a little afraid that this is going to lead to excessive expenditures.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain it to the gentleman from Oklahoma. I admit that I probably have been guilty of negligence in not discussing it with him before, but things have been going pretty rapidly here and I have not had the opportunity. I remember the position the gentleman took when this matter was before the House in the way of legislative authorization. In the hearings it developed that the Budget had approved only \$50,000 for this purpose, but also it developed in the hearings that it was the judgment of the Indian Bureau that it was wiser to appropriate \$100,000 at this time for the reason that when these suits are actually commenced it is possible that all of the funds involved that are not obligated by appropriations will be impounded, and could not thereafter be reached.

By making the appropriation now, before the funds are tied up, we make it sure that the money will be available

if needed, and we are assured by the Indian Bureau that just because the appropriation is made, does not mean they are going to spend it unless it is really necessary.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am very glad to have that explanation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I felt sure it would meet with the approval of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Roads and trails, national parks: For an additional amount for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails in national parks, and monuments, and of national park approach roads, inclusive of necessary bridges, in accordance with the act approved April 9, 1924, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (Public Act No. 592, 71st Cong.), including national monument approach roads, \$2,500,000 to remain available until expended.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 38, line 3, after the word "expended," insert a colon and the words: "Provided, That approach roads to national monuments shall be included within the provisions of such act under the same conditions as approach roads to national parks, and the limitation therein on the amount of annual allocation of funds to national park approach roads shall be inclusive of such national monument approaches."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will explain the situation. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will remember that recently a bill was passed authorizing money to be spent on approach roads to national parks and national monuments. The gentleman will also remember there was a very liberal amount of amending done on the floor and in the course of that amending the words "national monuments" were not repeated in all of the places. It simply stated in some of the places "national parks" and did not couple with that "national monuments," although the whole purpose of the act was to serve both.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that it was limited solely to approach roads to national parks.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall any discussion as to applying it to approach roads to national monuments.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not remember about the discussion, but the amendments which the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] and I offered did not carry the words "national monuments." The result is that they are restricted in their use of the money beyond what was the purpose. It is not expected to use much for national monuments, but occasionally it is very desirable.

In offering this amendment, which is correcting what was an error in the amendment of the authorization act, I am offering it at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands [Mr. COLTON], and at the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], both of whom were very active in promoting the original legislation, and who desire this correction.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give an estimate as to how much of the appropriation will be utilized for appropriations for approaches to national monuments? I was in sympathy with the idea of appropriating national funds for the construction of approach roads for national parks, because of the inability of the States to furnish sufficient funds, or on account of their being derelict in not projecting roads to our national parks.

Mr. CRAMTON. The law authorizes an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for both. It is my understanding there will not be over ten or fifteen or, at most, fifty thousand dollars spent on the approach roads to national monuments.

Mr. LEAVITT. If the gentleman will yield, the only two small projects that I have immediately in mind are one in Utah and another in Nebraska.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Prohibition: The provision, contained in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1931, regarding the use of funds therein appropriated for the Bureau of Prohibition for the payment of storage in private warehouses shall not preclude the rental of private space for the storage of inflammable property now stored in the Government warehouse, New York City.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order to inquire how general is the demand for storage space for wet goods captured by the prohibition unit.

Mr. WOOD. There seems to be great demand. They have so much now in the Federal building at New York that they are asking to get out of there because of the fact that it is explosive. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say that from my personal knowledge, and I believe the gentleman from Indiana will confirm me, the real good old stuff did not have any explosive qualities, at least before it was drunk.

Mr. WOOD. There would not be any complaint by the gentlemen who are occupying the building if it was old stuff, but they are afraid of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall exactly what the authority of law is for the disposition of captured, ostensibly good liquor.

Mr. WOOD. Any kind of liquor, good, bad, or indifferent—

Mr. STAFFORD. I said "ostensibly."

Mr. WOOD. Under the law it must be held until the court orders its disposition. It occurs to me they are a little slow about ordering its disposal for they have 250 truck loads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say there are 250 truck loads of liquor in the possession of the Government, that has not been disposed of by decree of the court?

Mr. WOOD. Two hundred and fifty truck loads. They get it in large quantities up there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where? Please tell the Members of the House so that the country will know.

Mr. WOOD. There is a statute which requires that all these goods shall be stored in Government-owned warehouses. They have this Government building loaded to the gunwales, and the people housed on the upper floors are fearful of being blown up one of these days.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman does not think that with the continued administration of this unenforceable liquor law we will be called on to erect Government warehouses for the storage of the wet goods pending the action of the courts in decreeing their disposition.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.: For the United States penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1931, \$113,945.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the Appropriations Committee to a condition which exists in the Atlanta Penitentiary—and which, I am informed, exists also at Leavenworth—which condition, I think, is a disgrace to this country. The guards at the Atlanta Penitentiary—and I am informed that the same is true at Leavenworth—have to work 70 hours a week. I have taken this matter up with the Director of Prisons, Mr. Bates, and he tells me that he made a request of the Bureau of the Budget for additional funds in order to correct this situation, but they declined to grant the funds.

I am not going to offer an amendment to this bill at this time but I do want to ask the Appropriations Committee, when they have this matter up again, to take that question under consideration and make an investigation of it. I am satisfied that no Member of this House wants a Government employee to work longer hours in the employment of the

Government than the prisoners themselves have to work. Yet that is the situation in these penitentiaries. There are 150 men in the Atlanta Penitentiary, working as guards for small salaries, who work 70 hours a week—10 hours a day, 7 days a week—and they are really in a worse condition than the men they are guarding, as far as their hours of work are concerned. I hope the committee, when it has this matter up next time, will see to it that a sufficient appropriation is made for the payment of guards in order that their hours may be reduced.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ammunition storage facilities, Navy: The unexpended balance of the sum of \$1,193,998 appropriated by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, for "Ammunition storage facilities, Navy, fiscal years 1928 and 1929," and continued available during the fiscal year 1930 by the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, and during the fiscal year 1931 by the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1932; and the total cost of the establishment and development of a naval ammunition depot in the Territory of Hawaii, as authorized by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, is increased from \$3,540,000 to \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That \$450,000 of the unexpended balance under appropriations heretofore made under this title shall be available for the acquisition of land, in addition to the amount made available of such purpose by said second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928: *Provided further*, That the total authorized cost of the ammunition storage facilities authorized by said act shall not be exceeded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether in the hearings with reference to the various increases of authorizations for public buildings and other public works there is any testimony showing that the cost of construction, by reason of the present industrial depression, had decreased; and if so, to what extent.

Mr. WOOD. The cost of building materials has been reduced from 15 to 20 per cent as compared with 1929.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether the estimates were predicated upon the low prices occasioned by the industrial depression, or whether the estimates were based on former existing conditions.

Mr. WOOD. These now are based on present conditions, but those that were made for buildings—the contracts for which had been let—were based upon the old order of things. However, in almost every case the bid that has been accepted is considerably under the amount of the appropriations. All together, those lapses, sales, and so forth will add to the general building fund in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the average period of time for the construction of a public building from the time the contract is awarded?

Mr. WOOD. That depends on the size of the building.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, it varies; but what is the average?

Mr. WOOD. I really do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. The building in Chicago has been going on for almost a quarter of a century and still has not been started. I understand a site has not yet been determined upon.

Mr. WOOD. They determine upon a site and then decide to make a change, so that the building has never been commenced. But, as I say, it depends a great deal on the size of the building and on how fast the man who has the contract pushes the building to its final completion. If all of these contractors had the push behind them that the man had who erected the Department of Commerce Building, and who is now erecting the House Office Building, they would be built twice as fast as many of them are now being built.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read down to and including line 5, page 57.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that

that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 17163, the second deficiency bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. GRAHAM presented a conference report, for printing under the rule, on the bill (H. R. 980) to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the Committees of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 15256. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 16654. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT CANNELTON, IND.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 6064) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman regards this as an emergency matter?

Mr. DUNBAR. It is an emergency matter; yes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., authorized to be built by the Hawesville & Cannelton Bridge Co., by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, heretofore extended by act of Congress approved May 13, 1930, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from March 1, 1931.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION ON GOVERNMENT ISLAND, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6105) to authorize the construction on Government Island, Alameda, Calif., of buildings required by the Bureau of Public Roads and Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and the Coast Guard of the Treasury Department. A similar House bill has been reported by the committee and is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman regards this as a matter of emergency?

Mr. CARTER of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon acceptance of title by the United States to land on Government Island, in the city of Alameda, Calif., conveyed under authority of joint resolution of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1018), the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause plans to be prepared, by contract or otherwise, and to construct on said land such buildings as may be required (a) by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for a supply depot, warehouse, and shops; (b) by the Coast Guard of the Treasury Department for a supply depot, warehouse, shops, garage, living quarters for 75 men, and a marine railway for boats approximately 75 feet in length; and (c) by the Bureau of Public Roads, Forest Service, and Coast Guard for a joint administrative building.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and the preparation of the site for the buildings authorized hereby, including necessary roads, streets, and bridges, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$800,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from California whether this is of such pressing urgency that the bill could

not wait until Saturday when it will be called up on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. CARTER of California. The departments are very anxious, I may say to the gentleman, to have action on this bill, and it has been expedited through the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there is a companion bill on the House Consent Calendar which would be reached in the regular order on Saturday?

Mr. CARTER of California. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will permit, is the bill as it passed the Senate, identical with the bill as reported by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. CARTER of California. It is in exactly the same language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves an expenditure of \$800,000 and the gentleman is asking that it be taken up here without debate, by unanimous consent, and passed in half a second.

Mr. CARTER of California. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman understands through the press that the President of the United States has given it out publicly that he expects to veto the bill for the relief of ex-service men that was passed here in the House the other day with only 39 votes against it, and with the largest attendance we have had in the House during this session, and yet the President is going to veto the bill because of alleged economy and because he alleges that the Government is not able financially to spend the money for our ex-service men who are in distress and need of money. Does the gentleman think we ought to take up this \$800,000 bill under such circumstances and pass it in the twinkling of an eye, without debate, in the face of a veto that is coming here from the White House in a day or two? I hardly think it ought to be done.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from California was not one of the 39?

Mr. CARTER of California. No; I was not one of the 39.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This bill came before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, was given a careful hearing, and was reported out by a unanimous vote.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana should have been with us, but was not, and our friend from California [Mr. CARTER] did stand by the ex-service men so valiantly the other day when we passed their relief bill, and I feel sure they are going to stand by them and help us pass the bill over the veto of the President, I withdraw my objection. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

H. R. 10560—BANK SLANDER BILL

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 10560, and to include an article entitled "Soviet Letter Urges Run on Federal Banks."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the indorsement of the following officers of the Treasury Department:

(a) J. W. Pole, Comptroller of the Currency.

(b) A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) R. A. Young, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

(d) This proposed legislation also was indorsed by the American Bankers' Association, as shown in letter, dated

February 26, 1930, from its general counsel, reading as follows:

Your bill . . . to punish libel and slander of national and State bank members of the Federal Reserve System has the hearty approval of the American Bankers' Association. Instances are most frequent where malicious persons from a variety of motives circulate malicious stories affecting the standing and solvency of particular banks which very often have the effect of causing serious injury and loss. The banks certainly need the protection of a Federal statute of this kind.

(e) Congressman Wood, of Indiana, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, January 9, 1931, page 1883, made this statement:

Now that another great disaster has overtaken this country and misery has been spread not only over the prairies of our section but over the entire land, there is another set of vultures in human form that are taking advantage of the situation. They are trying to destroy the banking institutions of this country. They have been responsible for more bank failures than you imagine. It is known that they will go into a town, find out who the depositors in a bank are, and then circulate stories which raise a doubt as to the solidity of the bank, and that extends until it gathers such force as to cause runs upon such bank. That has been done in many instances.

(f) According to newspaper articles from Jackson, Miss., of date January 20, 1931, the First National Bank of Jackson and the Peoples Bank of Utica, 20 miles southwest of Jackson, closed their doors because of a gradual withdrawal and seepage of deposits, which the directors stated was due to a circulation of rumors concerning the banks' condition.

(g) According to Associated Press reports, runs have been made on banks throughout the United States, causing closing of their doors, due, as alleged, to the circulation of false reports as to the condition of banks, the deposits in the banks approximating from \$160,000 to \$7,000,000.

(h) It is a well-known fact that the two days' run on the Perpetual Building Association of Washington was due to the circulation of false or malicious rumors.

On February 5, 1931, the Evening Star had an editorial entitled "Rumors and Bank Runs," part of which is as follows:

That this "run" upon the Perpetual Building Association was started by the circulation of rumors is suspected. Indeed, there is evidence almost of an organized attempt to shake confidence. If such is the case somebody has been guilty of an abominable action, whether or not it is contrary to statute law to spread malicious or irresponsible reports calculated to cause runs on financial institutions. It may be impossible to find those who caused yesterday's demonstration of panic in this city. But the case stands as advertisement of the fact that conviction of circulating false reports affecting banks and similar organizations may result in a term of imprisonment, and this should be a wholesome warning against such rumor mongering in the future.

(i) In the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1931, the following item from Philadelphia appeared:

REWARD AGAINST MALICIOUS BANK RUMORS IS POSTED

PHILADELPHIA.—The Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce will pay a \$10,000 reward for "information leading to the arrest and conviction of anyone spreading false and malicious rumors against any financial institution in Philadelphia," it has decided.

The action followed reports from business men that they had received anonymous telephone calls and letters advising them to withdraw their funds from various banks. Three banks have been forced to close during the past two weeks.

(j) Rome C. Stephenson, president of the American Bankers' Association, on January 4, 1931, made this statement:

In many bank troubles the only thing wrong with a bank was an unduly suspicious and apprehensive state of mind in its customers, created by no act or condition of its own but by baseless rumors which sometimes led them to destroy the value of their own deposits by demanding them immediately, forcing a bank to sacrifice its assets and otherwise disrupt its financial operations.

(k) These are only a few instances of the many which I have read and heard of whereby solvent banks, as well as banks carrying frozen assets, had to close their doors due to circulation of false reports concerning the financial condition of such banks.

(l) I also call attention to the fact that Congressman HOOPER, of Michigan, introduced a bill during the second

session of this Congress to punish persons guilty of derogatory statements affecting banks or trust companies and that Congressman HALL of Mississippi, a Member of the Fish communistic committee, recently introduced a similar bill.

(m) Although a majority of our States have enacted bank slander laws, yet any one State law does not reach into another State. Therefore when false reports are circulated from State to State by telegram, telephone, or radio, neither State can reach the offender in the other State. For instance, a person who may be in California who utters or circulates information derogatory to a bank in St. Louis can not be prosecuted under the State law of Missouri, nor can any law effective in California assume jurisdiction. The only recourse in such cases is to enact a Federal law to take care of the situation which is rapidly becoming a national evil.

(n) The Washington Post on last Sunday, February 15, carried an article by Reginald P. Mitchell, entitled "Soviet Letter Urges Run on Federal Banks—House Committee Will Seek Vote This Week for Protection—Malicious Reports Traced to Radicals—Representative McFADDEN Stresses Necessity of Quick Action," which is as follows:

Buttressed by hitherto unrevealed information disclosing that communist-inspired propaganda figured prominently in instigating bank runs during the last year, the House Banking Committee has girded itself to press for passage this week of the Brand bill to stamp out the fast-growing practice of circulating malicious rumors affecting Federal reserve banks.

That communists have been a leading agency cradling alarmist reports to undermine the stability of banking institutions in various parts of the country, irrespective of Federal reserve system affiliation, has been proven conclusively by a letter which recently entered the files of a governmental body here. It forms a priceless bit of documentary evidence in the sinister red collection increasing under the vigilant eye of more than one Federal group.

Across the top of the letters is printed "The Communist Party of America." Sent to one of its members, bearing a New York postmark, the communication is typewritten throughout, even to its own party name as a signature.

SPREADING OF RUMORS IS URGED

"All unit leaders are being urged to notify the workers of the bad conditions of all United States banks," the warning letter begins.

Yet in the face of flaming torches of this sort countless other rumormongers, with not the slightest apparent connection with the world revolutionists, have fabricated the wildest sort of yarns to foment a run, and to the latter class is generally attributed the source of the alarmist reports starting withdrawal sieges in the East during recent weeks.

The dissemination of fictitious rumors throughout the Nation in the last twelvemonth has occasioned so many financial disturbances, leading in not a few instances to outright banking-house failures, that the House Banking Committee has taken up the cudgel with redoubled efforts to seek an effective remedy—at least, the best legislation obtainable at the moment.

To Representative LOUIS T. McFADDEN of Pennsylvania, chairman of the committee, goes the credit for pushing passage of the needed measure particularly on the heels of developments here and in this region in late weeks.

FEELS LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY

"It is an old axiom that things can not be clearly seen until they hit you in your own home," Representative McFADDEN asserted yesterday. "We certainly trust, however, that the conditions that have existed here in the East, in New York City recently, and within the last week in Washington—the unnecessary runs on established stable institutions—will not have to happen throughout the country to bring this matter strongly enough home to each individual. I still strongly feel that this legislation is necessary, and I have been working and will continue to work for it to my utmost ability."

The Brand bill, taking its name from Representative CHARLES H. BRAND of Georgia, a member of the committee, is proposed as an amendment to the Federal reserve act, to read:

"Whoever maliciously, with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any national bank, or any State member bank of the Federal reserve system, which causes a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction in any court of competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

HOUSE COMMITTEE APPROVES

The House banking committee last Wednesday went on record unanimously in favor of immediate passage of the Brand bill, and at its direction Representative McFADDEN asked House leaders to permit consideration of the measure this week. He was assured that it would be called up.

The bill bears the hearty indorsement of Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the American Bankers Association, the Association

of Casualty and Surety Executives, and various other notable bankers canvassed. While the District Bankers Association has never taken any action on the bill, officers of the organization were authority for the statement that they knew of no bankers here who held the slightest opposition to the measure.

Secretary Mellon, in a letter to the committee on April 4, 1930, called attention to the fact that "similar legislation has been repeatedly recommended by the Comptroller of the Currency in his annual reports to Congress."

THIRTY-SEVEN STATES HAVE SLANDER ACTS

Considerable amazement has been registered in the absence of any Federal legislation to cover any phase of this subject. Thirty-seven States and Alaska have enacted a slander and libel of bank act, for the most part more severe in their own States than the Brand bill, but obviously the State laws encompass only their own Commonwealths.

Thus, where false and malicious reports may be circulated from State to State by wire, telephone, or radio, neither State can reach the offender. Only can an offender be nabbed in one of these 37 States when he spreads a malicious report about a bank in the same State, and in late months the interstate circulation of these fake rumors has attained an astonishing rise.

Not many weeks ago, to quote the substance of a confidential Government report, certain residents of a Florida city received anonymous long-distance calls from outside the State that a bank in their home city was in a shaky condition.

NAME IS REFUSED

"Who is this?" they invariably asked.

"I can't tell you, but you'd better get your money out," came the answer.

Withdrawals from the bank ensued, but the run was finally curbed.

In a large city not far from Washington the tenants of certain down-town office buildings were telephoned by mysterious persons that "such and such a bank is shaky and you'd better withdraw your money." Several million dollars were taken out in a sustained run, but the financial house, solidly backed by other banks there, withstood the run.

Another interesting case, also a Government exhibit, tells of a little Kansas town whose residents received cryptic telegrams, reading: "Get money out of Blank Bank." They were signed only "Wall Street." A run was said to have closed the bank.

The Brand bill will affect the 8,052 financial institutions which are members of the Federal reserve system, on the basis of the last bank tabulation. They include 7,033 national banks and the 1,019 member State banks. Of the 39 financial institutions in the District, it will affect only the 12 national banks here, leaving out the 22 savings banks, the 5 trust companies, and the 26 building and loan associations, none of which are in the Federal reserve jurisdiction.

TERMS LONG ARGUED OVER

The terms of the Brand bill have had a stormy history. They were embodied by Representative McFADDEN for the first time in his national bank bill, introduced on February 11, 1924, and re-incorporated in his bill of May 26, 1924, and his subsequent measure which is widely known as the McFadden banking bill, enacted into law on February 25, 1927, with the malicious-rumor terms stricken out.

These deleted provisions were bitterly assailed by a "State's rights" group in the House, contending that the States should be left to handle their own banking affairs, regardless of the interstate nature of reports circulation.

"The striking from my bill of this provision has never been clearly understood by me, and although I have not myself reintroduced it in any subsequent bill, a similar provision has been included in a bill in each Congress since that time," Representative McFADDEN explained. "However, the apparent single opposition thereto has so far seemed to prevail."

Opposition to the provisions has simmered down apparently to one man, Representative C. WILLIAM RAMSEYER, Republican, of Iowa, who fought the present Brand bill when discussion on it was sought on January 19.

SIMILAR BILLS KILLED

With the committee last week determined to concentrate its efforts on the Brand bill, it automatically put out of consideration a similar bill of Representative JOSEPH L. HOOPER, of Michigan, a member of the committee, and another by Representative ROBERT S. HALL, of Mississippi, covering in the main penalties for boycotting and blacklisting banks. It was stated that the bill of the Representative from Georgia, introduced last March 6, was chosen as a courtesy because of the distressing banking conditions which have prevailed in his home State and section.

The full text of the communist letter, said to be available to the House Banking Committee, although not part of its own files, follows in large part:

"All unit leaders are being urged to notify the workers of the bad condition of all United States banks. Party units must give proper attention to small details and to the small tasks of immediate work without losing sight of the broad revolutionary perspective, the robbing of their banks by the capitalists, the increasing length of the bread lines, and the millions unemployed makes fertile soil for the American revolution.

LEGAL UNITS' ACTION URGED

"Every party member is a soldier in the revolutionary army. Every member must work and all forces must be concentrated so

that legal units can be organized and functioning when the party has to go entirely underground.

"The enlightenment campaign must be concretized; each member must be given a definite task. It is up to the party organizations to see that the workers are informed that the United States banks are unsafe; that the entire capitalist structure is crumbling; and that the day of the revolution is growing near."

Secretary Mellon, in lauding the Brand bill, declared, in his letter to the committee "It is believed that member banks of the Federal reserve system are entitled to have protection under Federal statutes from such statements when maliciously made and with intent to deceive," for "the proposed law would tend to deter malicious individuals from making or circulating such false statements.

"It is understood that a number of States have enacted statutes similar to that proposed in the bill, which apply to banking institutions in those States," he continued. "It would seem that all national and all State member banks should have the benefit of legislative protection from malicious attacks of this kind against which there appears no other effectual means of protection. The proposed bill would also serve to protect against such misstatements which are made in one State concerning a bank in another State, as State laws are not ordinarily effectual against these."

STATES WITH LAWS LISTED

States at present with a slander and libel of bank act include New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Alabama, Rhode Island, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Iowa (1929), and Nebraska (1930).

Support of the American Bankers' Association for the measure is held significant. Its general counsel advised the committee that the bill "has the hearty approval of the American Bankers' Association."

"Instances are most frequent where malicious persons from a variety of motives circulate malicious stories affecting the standing and solvency of particular banks which very often have the effect of causing serious injury and loss," the association official wrote.

"The banks certainly need the protection of Federal statute of this kind which will act as a deterrent to many malicious individuals who, in the absence of a punitive statute, can freely circulate unfounded and injurious statements without fear of punishment."

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT CULBERTSON, MONT.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5987) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont., an identical House bill being on the calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont., authorized to be built by the State of Montana and the counties of Roosevelt and Richland, or any of them, by the act of Congress approved July 3, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from July 3, 1931.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 15256, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79, 81, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, and 128.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 63, 64, 75, 76, 83, 84, 87, 91, 96, 97, 98, and 112, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,585,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,709,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,497,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$223,572"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$58,120"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$56,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$345,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,420,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,826,126"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$130,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for range utilization research in cooperation with the United States Range Livestock Experiment Station at Miles City, Mont."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,084,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,954,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$72,306"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,947,201"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$183,035"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,863,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the sum stricken out by said amendment, and on page 68 of the bill, in line 17, strike out "\$395,880" and insert in lieu thereof "\$383,380"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,731,336"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,241,136"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,747,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$330,000"; and on page 87 of the bill, in line 2, strike out "\$15,610" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 130 and 131.

L. J. DICKINSON,
ROBT. G. SIMMONS,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
JOHN N. SANDLIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHAS. L. McNARY,
W. L. JONES,
WM. J. HARRIS,
JOHN B. KENDRICK,
E. D. SMITH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

AMENDMENTS DEALING EXCLUSIVELY WITH UNDER-AVERAGE SALARY INCREASES

The following amendments, as to which the accompanying report recommends that the Senate shall recede, deal exclusively with under-average salary increases: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, and 128.

AMENDMENTS ADJUSTING TOTALS, ALLOTMENTS, AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALARY LIMITATIONS

Recommendations in the accompanying report as to the following amendments are in adjustment of totals, allotments, and District of Columbia salary limitations, to conform to the recommendations with respect to the amendments involving appropriations: 17, 18, 30, 32, 33, 40, 52, 59, 60, 62, 67, 68, 75, 80, 81, 85, 99, 102, 103, and 116.

Recommendations as to other amendments are as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU

On No. 14: Strikes out the Senate increase of \$10,000 for the establishment of a full-service meteorological station at Missoula, Mont.; provides an increase of \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for forest-fire weather-warning service; and strikes out the Senate increase of \$30,320 for under-average salary increases.

On No. 16: Retains the Senate increase of \$4,240 for extending airways weather service in Alaska; strikes out the Senate increase of \$10,160 for airways weather service between Washington, D. C., and Boston, Mass.; and eliminates the Senate increase of \$8,260 for under-average salary increases.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

On Nos. 24 and 25: Eliminates the Senate increase of \$10,000 for poultry feeding and breeding research, and of \$4,030 for under-average salary increases.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

On No. 41: Retains the Senate increase of \$12,520 for pathological investigations, including studies of hardwood diseases and heart rots; and strikes out the Senate increase of \$1,668 for preliminary investigation of the Dutch-elm disease.

On No. 42 blister-rust control in the West: Eliminates the Senate increase of \$25,000, and of \$300 for under-average salary increases.

On No. 45: Retains the Senate increase of \$10,000 for the study of downy mildew of hops in the Pacific Northwest; and strikes out \$440, composed of \$220 inadvertently included in the bill as it passed the House for under-average salary increases, and an additional \$220 inadvertently added to the bill by the Senate for the same purpose.

On No. 50: Appropriates \$1,980 instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for blueberry investigations in the Southeast; strikes out the Senate increase of \$5,720 for investigations of troublesome weeds; and eliminates the Senate appropriation of \$420 for under-average salary increases.

On No. 51: Appropriates \$80,000 instead of \$90,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$73,080 as proposed by the House for maintenance of horticultural station at Cheyenne, Wyo.

On No. 53: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$35,000 for the establishment of an agricultural experiment station at Hermiston, Oreg.

On No. 54, under the appropriation for "Horticultural crops and diseases": Strikes out Senate increases of \$15,000 for studies concerning processing and handling of dates, and \$5,000 for experiments in citrous-fruit-handling problems, including coloring features, in Florida; retains Senate increases of \$10,000 for experiments and studies concerning pears, \$10,000 for Satsuma-orange investigations in northern and western Florida and southern Georgia, \$10,000 for grape investigations in the Gulf and South Atlantic States, and \$5,000 for nut-culture investigations in Northern and Eastern States; and appropriates \$10,000 instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the Senate for investigation of problems in the production of high-quality fruits, and \$10,000 instead of

\$20,000 as proposed by the Senate for a further increase of the appropriation for investigation of western yellow blight or curly top of tomatoes.

FOREST SERVICE

On No. 61: Strikes out the Senate increase of \$50,000 for control of white-pine blister rust in western national forests.

On No. 63: Inserts a comma.

On No. 64: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$15,000 for establishment of a forest experiment substation in the sand-hill region of North Dakota.

On No. 65: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$10,000 for range-utilization research in cooperation with the range livestock experiment station at Miles City, Mont., together with an amendment to correct the spelling of the word "range."

On No. 66, under the appropriation for "Forest products": Strikes out the Senate increases of \$15,000 for development of an antishrink treatment for wood, \$10,000 for improving the use of wood in frame buildings, and \$8,700 for investigating methods of improving the lasting qualities of paint and finishes on wood.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

On Nos. 74 and 76: Appropriates \$40,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House, for the establishment of a field laboratory for naval stores research work in the South; strikes out the Senate increase of \$224 for under-average-salary increases, and inserts the words "owned by the United States or," with respect to the site for the laboratory.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

On No. 82, Argentine-ant control: Appropriates \$15,000, instead of \$6,380 as proposed by the House and \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 83, Mexican bean beetle: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for investigations in the control of the Mexican bean beetle in the dry sections of New Mexico.

On No. 84, tobacco moth: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$10,000 for investigation of the tobacco moth.

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

On No. 87: Inserts the word "than," inadvertently omitted.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

On No. 91: Inserts a semicolon.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

On No. 95, forestry studies in Europe: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$12,500 for expenses of a forester to study forest-land utilization and other forestry matters in Europe, and amends the bill by making a corresponding reduction in the allotment for collecting and disseminating information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, etc.

On No. 96, market inspection of canned fruits: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$30,000 for the inauguration of a market-inspection service on canned fruits.

On No. 97, Market-news service: Inserts the word "tobacco."

On No. 98, market-news service: Retains the Senate appropriations of \$13,500 for establishment of a market-news service on livestock at Louisville, Ky.; \$2,600 for extension of leased-wire service on livestock to Ogden, Utah; \$30,000 for inauguration of a market-news service on tobacco, and \$20,000 for establishment of a market-news service on livestock at Casper, Wyo.

PLANT QUARANTINE AND CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

On No. 112, European corn borer: Retains the Senate increase of \$210,000 for prevention of the spread of the European corn borer.

SOIL-EROSION INVESTIGATIONS

On No. 129: Provides an increase of \$50,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate, for soil-erosion investigations and proposes an amendment to the bill adjusting the amount to be allotted for salaries in the District of Columbia.

IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference have not agreed with respect to the following amendments:

No. 130: Reenacting the "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri," approved March 3, 1930, making the same applicable to the crop year of 1931 with respect to the States of Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and appropriating the funds collected from the loans of 1930 in the latter States for the same purposes, for the crop year of 1931, in such States.

No. 131: The total of the bill.

L. J. DICKINSON,
ROBT. G. SIMMONS,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
JOHN N. SANDLIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 130: Page 91, after line 7, insert:

"That the act of Congress entitled 'Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri,' approved March 3, 1930, and fully set out in United States Statutes at Large, Seventy-first Congress, second session, volume 46, chapter 68, be, and the same is hereby, reenacted and made applicable to the crop year of 1931, with this limitation, that only the funds collected from the loans of 1930 in the States of Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, made under said act be available for the crop year of 1931; that said funds so collected be, and they are hereby, appropriated and made available for the purpose of carrying out this resolution for the crop year of 1931, in the States of Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida."

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur to the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the Senate amendment insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, for the crop of 1931, to make advances for loans to farmers in the States of Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida who suffered storm and/or drought losses to crops in 1929 and 1930 where he shall find that an emergency need for such assistance exists, for the purchase of seed of suitable crops, fertilizer, feed for work stock, and/or fuel and oil for tractors used for crop production, upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulation as he shall prescribe: *Provided*, That a first lien on all crops growing, or to be planted and grown, during the year 1931 shall in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture be deemed sufficient security for such advance or loan, to be immediately available \$2,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentlemen from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 131: Page 92, line 1, strike out the figures "213,055,702" and insert "\$214,109,670."

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$215,579,082."

The motion was agreed to.

CONDITION OF JUNIOR OFFICERS IN THE ARMY

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to some deplorable conditions among the junior officers of the Army of the United States, with a letter respecting it received to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention of the Members of Congress to the miserable condition of some of our junior officers in the United States Army. These splendid young men, well educated, honest, industrious, and loyal, in many cases with wives and other responsibilities, are facing hardships and degrading conditions. Their compensation is meager to the point of niggardliness. They are required to dress well and neatly, and meet other requirements, and face responsibilities calling for the expenditure of money. This can not be done in decency on their present pay and allowances. There are but a few days more in this Congress, and some attention must be paid this matter, and relief given immediately by the passage of the pay bill or some pay bill to relieve the intolerable conditions, if we are not to be shamed. Here is a letter I received to-day from a captain in the service which ought to stir out of apathy those of us responsible for the delay in passing an adequate pay bill.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16, 1931.

HON. ROY G. FITZGERALD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I am presuming, as a former constituent as well as an Army officer, to present some facts concerning the situation confronting the junior officers in the Army.

Your sympathetic attitude toward their problems is well understood. I shall therefore get promptly to a brief presentation of facts.

Since 1919 I have served several years in China, in Japan, as language officer, brief intervals in the Philippines, Hawaii, Presidio of San Francisco, Fort Benning, Ga., Madison Barracks, N. Y., and Washington, D. C. In that service with troops and staff, as a lieutenant and captain, I have become intimately acquainted with the situation in which the second and first lieutenants find themselves.

Since 1925 that situation has been acute. Since that time their hopes have been sustained by promised relief. For the past six years they have been expecting relief. Now they are on the ragged edge, financially and morally. Unless a congressional committee to consider pay and promotion is formed before the 4th of March from Members who will continue to serve in the new Congress, the naming of such a committee will be delayed until next December. That, in all likelihood, will mean the passage of another session without relief legislation.

I can assure you that long before that the morale of the junior officers will definitely have been destroyed. If it is destroyed, it will work progressive damage to the Army.

I am personally acquainted with scores of lieutenants who have been trying to keep out of debt on a salary of \$143 a month. Their wives are working as models and clerks in department stores, as day governesses, in whatever capacity they can obtain decent work. Last week I had a pair of them in to dinner. After dinner the wife broke down and cried; said how much she had enjoyed her dinner; that it was the first steak she had had in eight months.

My next-door neighbor pays his negro chauffeur \$150 a month and furnishes his meals, but that has nothing to do with the case in hand.

It is in the nature of men, when they voluntarily choose a certain profession for their life work, to give the best that is in them to their daily task. This whole-hearted interest in their work on the part of the men in the uniformed services of the United States is popularly, and properly, characterized as "devotion to duty." It is poor business for this country to jeopardize such devotion to its interests by denying its loyal servants a living wage. When a man begins to debate whether he can give his family a quart of milk or a pint of milk a day his attention is distracted from his work, his enthusiasm wanes, and the bright flower of "devotion to duty" becomes that faded and colorless thing known as "the perfunctory performance of allotted tasks."

In considering the general pay revision proposals I can not believe that Congress adequately has been made aware of the plight of the first and second lieutenants. It has not been possible for the Army, or their friends outside the Army, to fully present their case.

They themselves are wholly inarticulate.

They deserve special and immediate consideration above all other grades of the service.

I wish to say, in conclusion, that in making this plea for the two junior grades I have no personal axe to grind. Whether the pay of other grades is raised or not is immaterial to me. Both my wife and I have independent incomes and it is my intention soon to leave the service.

Because I have been more fortunately situated financially it has been my privilege to have been able to tide a number of these young officers over family emergencies during the past five years. Yet in each instance I vividly remember the pitiful embarrassment, akin to shame, that each applicant displayed. Each episode was a painful one for both of us. It is not easy for an honorable man of fine sensibilities to ask for a charity loan.

I deplore to see the high-minded officer in such a situation—forced on him, not by his own improvidence but by the neglect of his Government.

In bringing forward these facts I am mindful not only of his predicament but of the future efficiency and reliability of the Army.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN J. CLEAR,
Captain of Infantry, United States Army.

HOSPITALIZATION BILL

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. HALL], who is ill, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the hospitalization bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, at the solicitation of the officials of the American Legion of my State and in cooperation with the legislative department of the American Legion of this city, I introduced H. R. 14561, in which I asked for \$600,000 additional hospitalization facilities for the hospital located at Gulfport, Miss., and I now desire to thank the entire committee for the patient, courteous, and ample consideration given this bill. I especially desire to thank the subcommittee whose duty it was to thresh out into feasible and workable condition the many claims for the consideration of much hearings in order to reach an equitable solution of the many vexatious questions involved.

To the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentlewoman of Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and her coworker on the committee, Mr. RANKIN, of Mississippi, I am indebted for much consideration, patience, and assistance.

While I regret that there are some Congressmen disappointed, and who honestly believe that they should have received hospitals, I earnestly wish that in the near future all the deserving places and extensions may be secured. While I would have preferred the expenditure of \$600,000 at Gulfport, I am sincere in expressing my belief that the \$500,000 carried in this bill will be ample for the present needs of the disabled veterans within the zone accommodated by this institution.

For the information of the Congress let me state that the hospital at Gulfport is the only hospital within the State of Mississippi, and not only does it accommodate the World War veterans of Mississippi, but a considerable zone comprising other States beyond the confines of Mississippi.

I desire to state to the Congress that the hospital at Gulfport is for restricted neuropsychiatric cases. The World War veterans of Mississippi, sick and afflicted, sent to hospitals for other diseases, are compelled to go beyond the borders of my State for hospitalization. Many of them at the present are unable to secure hospitalization, yet I realize that our Government and the committee is meeting the situation and the needs as rapidly and as consistently as can be expected under this great problem which confronts our Nation.

I am one of the Congressmen who opposes any extension of the contract hospital theory. This Government of ours should be, and I believe is, amply able, both in wealth and in wisdom, to provide sufficient hospitals of its own to be controlled and managed by General Hines to relieve and to restore to perfect health those diseased boys who are capable of recovery and to take care to the end those unfortunates who are incurable. I believe it is impossible to care for the sick and the disabled under the contract plan. Certainly there will more or less seep in graft and other abuses, neglect, and various conditions inimical alike to the disabled veterans and to the Government, and I shall at all times support a liberal governmental policy as expressed by the chairman in her remarks in explaining this bill.

I feel that the greatest extension possible of the hospitalization of the veteran will be accomplished by the expenditure of this \$12,500,000, and I offer no apology to any taxpayer of America for my enthusiasm and vote for the passage of this enactment. Personally I would support a much larger appropriation for this purpose, but realize that hospitalization in the way of additions and improvements

to the present hospitals, the erection and establishing of more throughout the Nation, will come before the Congress annually for the next few years, and therefore I am content that this much is achieved in this direction at this time.

The condition of my own State is appalling and for the information of the Congress I desire to call attention to a letter received from Forrest G. Cooper, department commander of the American Legion in Mississippi, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MISSISSIPPI,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
January 15, 1931.

Hon ROBT. S. HALL,
United States Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: It is noted that H. R. 14561 is to be discussed before the committee on or about January 22. The American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary of this State are intensely interested in this particular bit of legislation since its passage would help solve the very difficult hospitalization problem in this State.

After going into the matter as to whether or not Mississippi needed additional hospitalization facilities, it was the unanimous opinion of the State executive committee that many Mississippi veterans are now, and have been, in actual need of immediate hospitalization. You may certify this statement, in part, by referring to the records of the bureau in Washington; however, those records will not give you a true picture of conditions here. For instance, there are held in the overcrowded State insane asylum at this time 12 veterans, some of them not because they are insane but because of lack of Government bed space; there is 1 in Natchez and 2 in Biloxi jails, also. It is very difficult to obtain space for 202 (10) cases in the Gulfport Hospital for the simple reason that we are told at every turn by the bureau—"No beds available."

We have spent and continue to spend money for veterans who should be in hospitals for treatment. It is true that many of these conditions could be taken care of and are being taken care of by private and charity hospitals. Yet it must be remembered that these men, most of them, have no funds and should receive these services under section 202 (10). In going over the hospitalization problem in this State with our service officers and post adjutants, the men who actually know the needs of disabled veterans, we find that in many cases now the veterans are told to wait and defer application for hospitalization, in the hope that the crowded conditions will disappear later. The true picture, then, is that hundreds of veterans of this State are in need of hospitalization, and because of lack of proper medical attention now we will have many of them on our hands as totally disabled in the next few years. We know that if members of the Veterans' Committee in Congress were to come to Mississippi and visit our American Legion post, they would report the bill out unanimously.

The American Legion of Mississippi has, in the past and will in the future, hesitate to request assistance from State and Nation except when we find by experience and fact that such a move is for the welfare of that State and Nation. And now, we earnestly plead that our Government do not fail us in our need for these additional hospital beds.

We are more than willing to bear our part for these unfortunate veterans and believe, in our hearts, that it would be far more humane, more just, and more economical to have beds awaiting veterans, at all times, than to have veterans awaiting beds.

Trusting that you will convey greetings and words of confidence to our many friends in Congress and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FORREST G. COOPER,
Department Commander.

This gives the Congress some idea of the present situation in Mississippi and it is needless to state that we must anticipate that the number of sick and disabled boys will increase rapidly during the next few years.

Let me say, also, for the information of the Members of Congress who may not know that the hospital at Gulfport is one of the most delightful locations in America. It is located in the ozone section of the South, the most healthy, the most inviting, surrounded by every influence and environment conducive to the life and happiness of a disabled soldier.

The State of Mississippi, through its legislature, had arranged for centennial celebration of the statehood prior to 1918. This beautiful location was selected on one of the most delightful points on the Gulf of Mexico. Engineers and landscapers had demonstrated great ability in laying out this plot for this celebration. Several beautiful buildings were constructed and much interest throughout the State in anticipation of the celebration; but, unfortunately, the world was engulfed at that time in the last Great War, and at the time the celebration was to be had the darkest and most devastating period of the war was being enacted.

Mississippi had contributed her quota in man power and wealth and patriotism to this horrible catastrophe, the equal of any State in the American Union. When the heart and mind of Mississippians were so engrossed with the seriousness of the war the celebration, unfortunately, was deemed unwise. Therefore the expenditure, the patience, and the ingenuity that my people had expended toward the celebration were valueless, so far as the original design.

When the Government desired to locate a hospital in Mississippi, the State patriotically ceded this valuable plot with the improvements to the National Government, for a reasonable consideration, which has been extended and beautified by the Government.

The appropriation made at the last session of Congress further extended the facilities at Gulfport, which I rejoice to report is now proceeding, and with this additional \$500,000 I think this hospital will be sufficiently equipped to take care of the present pressing demand. I think it is much better the Gulfport hospital was given \$500,000 lump sum than to have had any particular number of beds allotted. I am of the opinion those in charge of the construction now being carried on will be in better position to expend the \$500,000, without reference to the number of beds, to greater service than if the Congress had limited the number.

I have full faith in General Hines, the Director of Veterans' Affairs, and believe that the appropriation that the Congress has given to this hospital will have the best facilities for the accommodation of the greatest number possible to achieve under all the circumstances.

Yes; I appreciate the consideration of the subcommittee, the report of the committee and the service of every Member of Congress from Mississippi, as well as the two distinguished Senators in manifesting their great interest and unrelinquished zeal in securing this additional need.

Permit me to add also that I have never contacted a sick, afflicted World War veteran in the Gulfport Hospital that has not expressed himself charmed with its location, who is not electrified by the magic waters and unexcelled breezes of my coast country, and who has not been stimulated and refreshed by the touch of the southern hand, and who does not delight in the gentle, the loving, caressing southern sentiment that engulfs this beautiful institution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask for the adoption of an order in regard to to-morrow's exercises. It has become important that we transact some business to-morrow afternoon after the completion of the memorial exercises. The order that was passed some time ago for the memorial exercises provided that upon the completion of the exercises the House should immediately adjourn. I now present an order providing that immediately after the completion of the memorial exercises the House shall continue to stand in recess until 2.30 o'clock p. m., and then continue the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that the order heretofore made be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask now for the present consideration of the order which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Thursday, February 19, 1931, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials under the provisions of clause 40-A of Rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall be given the privilege of extending their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Following the completion of the memorial exercises the House shall continue to stand at recess until 2.30 o'clock p. m., as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it embraced within the gentleman's idea that there shall be nothing done except to finish the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. TILSON. There may be conference reports.

Mr. BLANTON. There could be a bunch of conference reports that would continue the consideration of the bill and keep us here until late to-morrow night, when we had understood there would be no business transacted to-morrow.

Mr. TILSON. If it be necessary, we should have to do so. The gentleman must not think that we can stop business entirely.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Connecticut must understand that it has been generally understood by the membership that nothing would be done to-morrow except the memorial exercises. He now puts on us another half day's work.

Mr. TILSON. We must get through with this appropriation bill at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BLANTON. It does seem to me that the gentleman ought to confine work to be done to-morrow to the appropriation bill.

Mr. TILSON. I do not think that is quite fair to the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not in any way obstruct the business of the House.

Mr. TILSON. No other business is planned to come up than that which I have mentioned, although something might arise that may be important.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not throw any monkey wrenches into the machinery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the order?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The order was agreed to.

BUSINESS ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1931

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, the 23d, the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m., and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Beck] may proceed for one hour on the subject of George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND for three days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows: S. 5789. An act for the relief of the United States Hammered Piston Ring Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

- H. R. 318. An act for the relief of William S. McWilliams;
- H. R. 566. An act for the relief of Charles Smith;
- H. R. 589. An act for the relief of Abram H. Johnson;
- H. R. 780. An act for the relief of George Selby;
- H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Mary Neaf;
- H. R. 1526. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Hayden;
- H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of William Parish;
- H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Joseph Pulitzer;
- H. R. 2584. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Sutton;
- H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of Anna E. Stratton;
- H. R. 3368. An act for the relief of Joseph Marko;
- H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of William L. Wiles;
- H. R. 4731. An act for the relief of Frederick Rasmussen;
- H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Joseph Bratton;
- H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Mary L. Dickson;
- H. R. 5926. An act for the relief of Lillian N. Lakin;
- H. R. 6259. An act for the relief of Alma Rawson;
- H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance it flows through Athens County, Ohio;
- H. R. 9215. An act for the relief of Jessie Axton;
- H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the

United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

H. R. 10017. An act to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

H. R. 10542. An act for the relief of John A. Arnold;

H. R. 10652. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase land and to construct buildings and facilities suitable for radio-research investigations;

H. R. 11268. An act for the relief of Mary C. Bolling;

H. R. 11820. An act to authorize issuance of a patent for certain lands to J. R. Murphy;

H. R. 12094. An act to provide for conveyance of certain lands in the State of Alabama to vocational or other educational uses or to dispose of the lands upon condition that they shall be used for such purposes;

H. R. 12284. An act to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie;

H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 15064. An act to reserve 440 acres of public-domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif.;

H. R. 15267. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the cancellation, under certain conditions, of patents in fee simple to Indians for allotments held in trust by the United States;

H. R. 15877. An act to authorize exchanges of land with owners of private-land holdings within the Craters of the Moon National Monument;

H. R. 16159. An act authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000 to defray the expenses of the Pan American Commercial Conference, to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1931;

H. R. 16215. An act authorizing the sale of surplus power developed under the Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 16248. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Co. lands on the Virginia shore of the Potomac River near the west end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge; and

H. R. 16913. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii," approved March 10, 1924.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, February 19, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider bills relating to reapportionment.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 17163. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. A report pursuant to House Resolution 191 on the investigation of

Hon. Harry B. Anderson, United States district judge in Tennessee (Rept. No. 2714). Ordered printed.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 17037. A bill for the enrollment of children born after December 30, 1919, whose parents, or either of them, are members of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 17. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 95. A bill authorizing good-conduct-medal award to enlisted men of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SWICK: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 17116. A bill to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 5732. An act to authorize the acquisition for military purposes of land in Orange County, N. Y., for use as an addition to the West Point Military Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14811. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land and buildings thereon joining the West Point Military Reservation, N. Y., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 2724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 15923. A bill to prohibit the recovery of any indebtedness to the United States from either the principal or the interest due and payable to any depositor in the military or naval service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16953. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain land in California for addition to the Cahuilla Indian Reservation, and issuance of a patent to the band of Indians therefor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Education. S. 5139. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to Porto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 2727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SIMMS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10506. A bill for the relief of Carl F. Castleberry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16932. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. LaForge; without amendment (Rept. No. 2717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3199. An act authorizing refunds to certain railroads of interest erroneously collected on account of overpayments under sections 209 and 212 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17159) granting a pension to Mary Jane Delozier, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 17163) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1931, and June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17164) to amend the tariff act of 1930 to authorize export-debenture certificates on agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 17165) to authorize the construction of a laundry building at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 17166) to amend the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 17167) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 17168) to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 17169) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFNER: A bill (H. R. 17170) to legalize a bridge across the St. Francois River one-fourth mile south of Greenville, Wayne County, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 17171) to provide for the furnishing of food to children attending schools in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 17172) to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Bureau hospital in northern West Virginia; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 17173) to amend the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service," and amendments thereto; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17174) extending jurisdiction to the United States Court of Claims in suits arising from the issuance of seamen's insurance by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department during the period between June, 1917, and June, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 17175) to amend section 882 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 509) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell to the Port of New York Authority certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 510) authorizing an annual appropriation for the maintenance of headquarters for the National Council of Intellectual Cooperation for the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 511) to transfer into the classified civil service all veterans of any war employed by the Government in unclassified

positions who have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed forthwith to a treaty with Canada for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of a treaty with Canada for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York (the Assembly concurring) that the President of the United States be appropriately memorialized to proceed forthwith to a treaty with Canada for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at the earliest possible date and in accordance with the plans agreed upon by the joint board of engineers and submitted to President Coolidge December 27, 1926 (S. Doc. 183, 69th Cong., 2d sess.), or such amendment to or changes in said plans as may be subsequently adopted by such board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: Memorial in the nature of a joint resolution passed by the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reimburse all veterans of World War the amounts which they paid as premiums on war-risk insurance while in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Memorial in the nature of a resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States to proceed forthwith to a treaty with Canada for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 17176) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 17177) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 17178) granting a pension to Margaret White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 17179) granting an increase of pension to Janette Eskridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 17180) for the relief of Catherine Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17181) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 17182) granting an increase of pension to Maria C. Atherly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9932. By Mr. BEEDY: Petition favoring House Joint Resolution No. 356 providing for an amendment to the United States Constitution excluding unnaturalized aliens when making apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9933. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of Price T. Smith, Lella Brown, Della Douglas, and 47 other citizens of La Grange, Ky., praying for the enactment into law of the

Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9934. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of citizens of Hampton, Va., urging passage of proposed Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9935. Also, petition of citizens of Hampton, Va., urging support of proposed Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9936. By Mr. BRIGGS: Communication of Court Star of the Sea, No. 228, of Galveston, Tex., voicing opposition to the passage of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9937. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the executive secretary of the Social Service Commission, New York City, urging the passage of the Wagner public employment office bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9938. Also, letter from the secretary of the Women's City Club of New York, urging the passage of the Wagner public employment office bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9939. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Matilda Heiskell, of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and 26 other citizens of Dearborn County, Ind., urging the passage of the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9940. Also, petition of Mrs. James Jacques and 38 other citizens of Indiana, urging the passage of the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9941. Also, petition of Blanche C. Carr and 12 other citizens of Hartsville, Ind., urging the passage of the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9942. By Mr. CARTER of California: Petition of Mrs. E. G. Wilcox and members of the Ephepheta Society of Catholic Women, of Oakland, Calif., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4582, regarding the distribution and sale of contraceptive literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9943. Also, petition of Lulu Mulhern, Grand Regent Court, No. 159, Catholic Daughters of America, and 300 others of Oakland, Calif., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9944. Also, petition of the Alumnae Association of Notre Dame San Jose-Belmont, of Berkeley, Calif., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4582, regarding the distribution and sale of contraceptive literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9945. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Anna R. Downes, Chicago, Ill., on behalf of Women's Catholic Order of Foresters, opposing Senate bill 4582 and other legislation, designed to remove restrictions on birth-control information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9946. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Charleston Four Corners, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9947. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Montgomery County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9948. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Canajoharie, N. Y., favoring enactment of the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9949. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Federation of Jewish Women's Organization of Greater New York (Inc.), in convention assembled, urging that any legislation further restricting immigration should make adequate provision for admitting the relatives of citizens and resident aliens who are, under our present immigration laws, entitled to non-quota or preferential quota status; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9950. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Miami Valley Guernsey Association, of Hamilton, Ohio, Harry J. Smith, secretary-treasurer, of R. R. No. 4, Dayton, Ohio, protesting against permitting butter substitute to be colored with un-

bleached yellow palm oil unless subjected to the 10-cent tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9951. Also, petition of League of Women Voters, in Dayton, Ohio, by Doris Carothers, executive secretary, and Mrs. Walter G. Schaeffer, urging favorable action on House Joint Resolution 292 and Senate bill 255, the latter relative to infancy and maternity control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9952. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of 135 residents of Gardner, Mass., favoring payment of soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates at their matured face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9953. Also, petition of 34 citizens, residents of Winchendon, Worcester County, Mass., urging immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9954. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Mrs. Orie W. Simpson and other residents of Goshen, Ind., urging passage of the Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9955. By Mr. JAMES of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Calumet and Laurium, Mich., urging support of the Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9956. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of citizens of McKeesport, Pa., praying for payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9957. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of the Sacred Heart Social Club, of Lancaster, Pa., against passage of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9958. By Mr. MAPES: Petition recommending the Sparks-Capper alien representation amendment, providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States excluding approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts among the States, signed by 40 citizens of Grand Haven, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9959. Also, petition recommending the Sparks-Capper alien representation amendment, providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States excluding approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts among the States, signed by 35 citizens of Grand Haven, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9960. Also, petition recommending the Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356) providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States excluding approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts among the States, signed by 50 citizens of Kent City, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9961. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Harry J. Cronen and 479 other veterans of both Spanish-American and World Wars, urging an amendment to House bill 15621, in order that no veterans will be denied benefits of disability allowance because of willful misconduct, who are suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9962. By Mr. ROBINSON: Memorial of H. J. Conrad, recording secretary, and other members of Julien Lodge, No. 379, International Association of Machinists, Dubuque, Iowa, relating to trusts and monopolies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9963. Also, resolution from F. C. Barney, secretary, Chapin, Iowa, which was passed at a recent meeting of the Holstein Breeders of Iowa, strongly urging the passage of House bill 15934, placing a tax on oleomargarine colored to resemble butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9964. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Catholic Women's Federation of the city of Rochester, N. Y., opposing enactment of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9965. Also, petition of the Catholic Women's Club, of Rochester, N. Y., opposing enactment of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9966. Also, petition of Lena Hill and 22 other citizens of Medina, N. Y., urging enactment of the Sparks-Capper bill, providing for constitutional amendment excluding aliens from the count for representation in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9967. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Nashua Farmers Co-op Creamery Co., Nashua, Minn., favoring passage of the Brigham bill, H. R. 15934, to impose a tax of 10 cents per pound on all yellow oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9968. Also, petition of American Legion Posts of Waubun and Mahanomen, Minn., favoring immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates at face value to veterans that desire payment thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9969. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of 22 members of the Loyal Workers' Sunday School Class, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Lincoln, Kans., favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9985; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9970. Also, petition of the Ladies' Aid, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Logan, Kans., favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9971. Also, petition of Priscilla Club, of Menlo, Kans., under auspices of the Women's Club, for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9972. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Wesley Douglass, R. F. D. 3, Beaver Falls, Pa., and 38 members of Beaver County Pomona Grange, No. 68, Patrons of Husbandry, urging the enactment of the Sparks-Capper amendment, H. J. Res. 356, excluding unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for reapportionment of congressional districts among the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9973. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions of Eastern States Farmers' Exchange, Springfield, Mass., protesting against the exemption from the usual 10-cent tax of oleomargarine colored by the use of unbleached palm oil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9974. By Mr. YATES: Petition of business men of the city of Chicago, Ill., protesting against any action of Congress for the cashing in whole or in part of the World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9975. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Illinois, urging the passage of legislation for the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates at full face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1931

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 17, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent order of yesterday the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 17054) to increase the loan basis of adjusted-service certificates, which was reported from the Senate Committee on Finance without amendment.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, JUSTICE, AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have here the conference report on House bill 16110, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932. It is a complete report.

I do not think its consideration will require any time. If it does, I should not want to interfere with the debate on the bill which is now before the Senate. With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I do, assuming that it will lead to no debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has stated that he would not press it if it does.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I would withdraw my request for present consideration if it should lead to any debate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington if the report represents a complete agreement?

Mr. JONES. Yes; it does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received.

Mr. JONES submitted the following report:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16110) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, and 160.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 147, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$1,960,588; in all, \$1,985,588"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$2,000,000," and on page 14 of the bill, in line 2, after the word "expended," insert the following: " : Provided, That in expending appropriations for the foregoing purposes obligations shall not be incurred which will require expenditures in excess of the total of \$10,000,000 now authorized by law "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,587,709"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$328,160; in all, \$343,160"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$646,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: